THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

VOL. XXXVI, No. 2 APRIL, 1929

Inspiration and Revelation
BENJAMIN A. WHITTEMORE 129

The American New Church in the Foreign Field
PHILIP M. ALDEN 152

Emerson and the Doctrine of Correspondence. II.
CLARENCE PAUL HOTSON 173

"The New Evolution" [A Review of a paper by Austin H. Clark]
GEORGE HENRY DOLE 187

"Science in Search of God" [A Review of a book by Kirtley F. Mather]
LOUIS A. DOLE 194

(For Editorial Department, see next page.)

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

Editorials :

What is Christianity? LEWIS F. HITE - - - - - - 208
Ideals of Love and Marriage H. CLINTON HAY - - - - 219

Biblical and Doctrinal Studies :

Two Parts in Life ANDRE DIACONOFF - - - - - - 226
Neighbor and World Court EVERETT K. BRAY - - - - 231

Current Literature :

Lewis Field Hite's "Swedenborg's Historical Position"
AUSTIN WARREN, PH. D. - - - - - - - - - 239
Dr. William Frederic Pendleton's "Topics from the Writings" LEWIS FIELD HITE - - - - - - - 241
Bishop Charles Gore, Henry Leighton Goudge and Alfred Guillaume (Editors) "A New Commentary on Holy Scripture" WILLIAM F. WUNSCH - - - 243
Warwick James Price's "The One Book"
CHAUNCEY G. HUBBELL - - - - - - - - - 246
Oscar Macmillan Buck's "Our Asiatic Christ"
HERBERT C. SMALL - - - - - - - - - - 249
Dr. William Burnside's "Theory of Probability"
B. A. WHITTEMORE - - - - - - - - - - 253

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW first appeared in January, 1894, succeeding the monthly *New Jerusalem Magazine* (established in 1827). The quarterly form is adapted to more elaborate articles and fuller discussion of current literature and current events. The REVIEW aims to serve as an international organ of the best thought, progressive and constructive as well as retrospective and critical, of the New Church.

The Board of Editors consists of the Rev. Lewis F. Hite as managing editor, the Rev. William F. Wunsch (in charge of "Studies") and Mr. B. A. Whittemore (in charge of "Current Literature"); with the Rev. H. Clinton Hay and Mr. Kenneth P. Kempton in an advisory capacity.

Published by THE MASS. NEW-CHURCH UNION

134 BOWDOIN STREET, BOSTON.

50 CENTS A COPY ALBERT P. CARTER, Treas. $2.00 A YEAR

(Postage to Canada 12 Cents, and to Europe 20 Cents Extra, Per Annum.)

Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter (Printed in U.S.A.)

THE
NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XXXVI.] APRIL, 1929 [No. 2

INSPIRATION AND REVELATION

BY BENJAMIN A. WHITTEMORE

IN *The Publishers' Weekly* of February 16, 1929, there is an article by Gilbert Loveland, who was formerly a clergyman but is now in the employ of a New York publishing house, entitled "Laymen's Interest in Religious Books." Mr. Loveland divides lay readers of religious books into three classes: laymen outside the churches who "are trying to come to friendly terms with the administration of the universe"; laymen within the churches who are "defenders of the *status quo*"; and laymen within the churches who are "inquirers" or "spiritual adventurers." Going on, he says:

> Less than a year ago I made a survey by personal interview with more than a hundred men, all of whom could be classified as either "inquirers" belonging to churches, or unchurched religionists. I asked each of them this question: "If you could order the publication of religious books for intelligent men, what would you order? What problems would you like to have considered?" Their replies boiled down as follows, with more than sixty per cent concentrating on the first two:
>
> 1. What kind of God can a man believe in this scientific day?
> 2. How should a man think of Jesus?
> 3. What is left of the Bible after criticism has done its worst?
> 4. Is prayer anything more than auto-suggestion?
> 5. Why is Christianity supposed to be superior to other religions? And what right has one religion to wage a campaign of religious imperialism?
> 6. What is the function of the Church in modern society?

Match this list of questions against the religious best sellers of 1928, and you have proof that religious thinking is cutting deeply these days. There is always a place for inspirational books, sermons, poems, biographies. But there is a special call just now for great "orientating" books that shed light without heat on the problems that vex men's souls in an existence daily becoming more complicated.

To my mind the most important of the questions here presented is the third: "What is left of the Bible after criticism has done its worst?" If in final analysis the judgment of the critics reduces the Bible to purely human literature, and if humanity accepts that judgment as conclusive, then the other questions have importance as independent inquiries. But if the Bible can maintain its traditional position as the inspired Word of God, then the other questions become subsidiary, as finding adequate answers in that volume. In view of this alternative, and in view of the supreme function of religion in the life of mankind, it may be asserted with good reason that the most important inquiry before humanity today concerns the inspiration of the Bible. It is to the consideration of this question that I invite your attention in this paper.

Men may be said to be of two types of mind: internal,—those who believe or are desirous of believing in spiritual things; and external,—those who are inclined to deny everything spiritual. Unfortunately, intellectual interest often leads men of the latter type to turn their attention to matters of the deepest concern to the spiritual welfare of humanity; and as "the intellect most commonly abolishes all faith in divine things" (Animal Kingdom, n. 21), they reach negative conclusions; and in their intellectual conceit they are inclined to promulgate their opinions as veritable truth. When much in the public eye, such persons often exert a decidedly baneful influence. Whether actually of the external type, or only perverted, Bertrand Russell seems to be a good example of this type, if we may judge by what he

says in his book entitled "A Free Man's Worship" (1923), wherein we find the following statement:

> That man is the product of causes which had no prevision of the end they were achieving; that his origin, his growth, his hopes and fears, his loves and his beliefs are but the outcome of accidental collocations of atoms; that no fire, no heroism, no intensity of thought and feeling, can preserve an individual life beyond the grave; that all the labor of the ages, all the devotion, all the inspiration, all the noonday brightness of human genius, are destined to extinction in the vast death of the solar systems, and that the whole temple of man's achievement must inevitably be buried beneath the débris of a universe in ruins—all these things, if not quite beyond dispute, are yet so nearly certain that no philosophy which rejects them can hope to stand. Only within the scaffolding of these truths, only on the firm foundation of unyielding despair, can the soul's habitation henceforth be safely built.

Here we have an expression of the quintessence of modernism; and what arrant nonsense it is! If it were not for the evil effects of such pronouncements upon the minds of the multitudes who do not think for themselves but by proxy, accepting the views of any loud-mouthed speaker conspicuously before the public who takes their fancy, such absurdity might best be ignored, as manifesting very defective rationality, however fluent the language.

Modernism in this extreme form results in complete infidelity, and tends to absolute atheism. Whatever the value of temperate modernism in undermining and uprooting the irrational accretions to the body of fundamental Christian doctrine since the time of Christ, we should not fail to recognize that its tendency is towards the extreme represented by the passage just quoted. And, unfortunately, so far has modernistic thought permeated the intelligent body of humanity in America (not to mention the rest of Christendom) that the infection of infidelity is felt everywhere; and in consequence those who have been brought up in religious ways, and have come to feel that the whole edifice of the religious life is "slipping" (if I may use a bit of current slang), have turned to such leaders as Harry

Emerson Fosdick, whom they apparently assume to have found secure footing in spite of the modernistic drift. I do not wonder at Dr. Fosdick's popularity in the present day; for he has apparently been fighting his way through the doubts that face thoughtful men of the internal type; but I believe he is leading his followers straight towards Unitarianism. His essay on "What Is Christianity?" in the current issue of *Harper's Monthly Magazine* shows how near bankruptcy such Christianity as his really is. Indeed, in this essay he as much as asserts that a life-and-death struggle is at hand, when, after stating that "the genius of Christianity lies in reverence for personality," and commending "Jesus of Nazareth" as "the champion of personality," he goes on:

> During this next generation Christianity will probably have to fight for its life, and the struggle will concern itself more and more manifestly with this central matter [of personality]. Rear-guard actions will continue around belated disputes about ancient miracles, biblical infallibility, and what not; but the crux of the conflict will not be there. Can we in this world maintain Jesus' attitude towards personality? The answer to that question is the sign of a falling or a rising Christianity.

Such a deplorable statement as that shows the desperate strait that Christian leadership of the modernistic sort as typified by Dr. Fosdick has come to. His "Modern Use of the Bible" (1924) shows how inadequate is his appreciation of the Word of God as veritable Divine revelation.

As New-Churchmen recognizing that religion is the most fundamental thing in human life, we need to combat the evil tendencies of modernism in every way we can; and to that end we may be encouraged by the words of Swedenborg in his fifty-fifth year, as found in n. 22 of his "Animal Kingdom":

> These pages of mine are written with a view to those only who never believe anything but what they can receive with the intellect, consequently, who . . . are fain to deny the existence of all supereminent things . . . such as the soul itself, and what follows there-

from—its life, immortality, heaven, etc., etc. . . . For these persons only I am anxious; and . . . for them I write, and to them I dedicate my work . . . [in the hope that] at last, under the favor of God, who is the sun of wisdom, an access will be opened and a way laid down, to faith. My ardent desire and zeal for this end is what urges and animates me.

To combat the advances of modernism in the religious field, Christian apologetics needs to start from grounds more elementary than those of theology, and to do what it can to undermine the presuppositions of the naturalism of the day, and to aim primarily to effect intellectual conviction as to the fundamentals essential to all religions worthy to be so classed. In this effort we need not concern ourselves overmuch with persons whose type of mind makes them unwilling to believe such fundamentals. But having in mind those who desire to believe, but have intellectual difficulty in reaching affirmative conviction with regard to such fundamentals, we need first of all to demonstrate* the existence of God. To the modern mind such demonstration is essential as putting a purpose behind the universe, and as putting a purpose into each individual human life. To one who really desires to believe, I hold that such demonstration is easy on the basis of the arguments from mathematical probability, from design, and from philosophic and psychologic necessity. We need next to demonstrate the actuality of the spiritual world, and of the immortality of the human soul,—this in order first of all to place our own lives here in proper perspective, and subordinately to give us confidence as to the assertions of Swedenborg with regard to his spiritual experiences and his description of the spiritual world, and to prepare us for unqualified acceptance of his teachings. To collect demonstrative evidence of the actuality of the spiritual world and of human immortality is the proper function of what Prof. Charles Richet, in his

*I use the word "demonstrate" here, and shall use it a number of times later. It should be obvious that I use it not in an absolute sense, but in an approximate one.

book entitled "Thirty Years of Psychical Research" (1923), has called "metapsychics,"—a term covering the entire field that engages the attention of those pursuing such investigations, concerning which Gladstone is reported to have said: "It is the most important work being done anywhere in the world today." For if there is a spiritual world inhabited by finite spiritual creatures who under favorable conditions can make things happen on this earth plane that require the theory of their actuality to account for the phenomena, that conclusion may become as valid on purely scientific grounds as is the demonstration of the actuality of the universal ether needed to explain the radio and many other intricate phenomena of nature. The actuality of that ether is outside our conscious experience; but who today would venture to say that it had not been demonstrated? That the work of psychic research will eventually result in practical proof of the actuality of the spiritual world, and incidentally of human immortality, and that that proof will be adequate to silence all scoffers and make all skepticism absurd, my own somewhat extensive reading in the best literature of the subject has convinced me.* Let us hear a few words on this point from that noted scientist, Sir Oliver Lodge, whose book entitled "Why I Believe in Immortality," from which I quote, appeared only last year:

> Arguments in favor of human survival, or that death is mainly a bodily transaction, are as old as humanity. . . . In this book I do not stress . . . these arguments, though I respect them. . . . My whole contention rests on a basis of experience, and on acceptance of a class of facts which can be verified at first hand by

*It seems to me wholly unnecessary for the New Church to take an attitude of unqualified disapproval of psychic research, though New-Churchman should seldom have active interest in it. The importance of the demonstration of the actuality of the spiritual world to our materialistic civilization in this benighted age is so important, however, that we may at least assume that such investigations, when carried on in scientific ways, are quite in accord with Divine permission, even although not to be considered as meeting with unqualified Divine approval.

others, if they take the trouble. I know how weighty the word "fact" is in science, and I say without hesitation that individual personal continuance is to me a demonstrated fact. This conviction has been reached through a study of obscure human faculty not yet recognized by orthodox science, and apparently not approved as a rule by theologians. (Foreword.)

There is no reason why the scientific demonstration or proof of human survival should be easy. Gradually modern science is beginning to attend, and in due time the whole thing will be put on a more satisfactory footing than at present. It is now going through the early stages, through which every nascent science has had to go. (P. 45.)

Psychic Science has not yet secured its charter of freedom; the experimental method in that science is under a cloud of suspicion and dislike. Facts are asserted by competent investigators which no orthodox society thinks it worth while to attend to: they [the facts] seem to be discordant with the general structure of the universe as now ascertained, and they are accordingly outside the pale. The time, however, will surely come when this opposition will be broken down by the force and continued reiteration of the facts themselves. (P. 50.)

In one form or another the phenomena have been asserted throughout human history. . . . They seem, somehow, alien to our present state of civilization, and only with difficulty can they be accepted by trained modern scientific observers. But all this only exhibits their immense importance, if once their actual truth can be established; for according to the assertions of investigators, they are of a very extensive variety. The facts involved are not mental alone, but are physical and physiological also; and if in the long run they prove true, it must mean the opening of far more than a new chapter, a new volume, in human knowledge. (P. 51.)

I have quoted thus at some length from Sir Oliver Lodge, because of his high standing in the field of natural science. While the majority of scientists of our day may think his interest in psychic research and his reiterated affirmations with regard to his belief in the demonstrations of immortality are but evidence of culpable aberration in an otherwise sound mind, I think we may more safely assume that his courageous facing of the obloquy of the scientific world in general in this particular is but prophetic of general acceptance of his position in times to come,—and that in the not

very distant future. In short, it seems to me that the time will surely come at no very distant date when the existence of God and the actuality of the spiritual world will be considered as so indubitably demonstrated that no one will have the temerity to express any incredulity, for fear of general ridicule. If I am right in this, it is but another bit of evidence that we are actually at the dawn of a new spiritual age, the sun of which will never set.

Following the demonstration of the existence of God, and of the actuality of the spiritual world, the next matter needing demonstration in this dark world is the fact of inspiration and revelation from the spiritual world, leading ultimately to the demonstration of the Word of God as divinely inspired throughout, and as the supreme and incomparable revelation possessed by humanity with regard to spiritual truth and as a guide to the heavenly life. As offsetting the harmful effects of naturalistic and therefore negative modern Biblical criticism, this is of the greatest importance. The demonstration of the existence of God and of the actuality of the spiritual world will inevitably go on apace apart from anything that New-Churchmen do or do not contribute to that work; and the demonstration once completed can never be undone, for (as I said before) we are in a new spiritual age that is to endure. But the demonstration of the Word of God as an actual Divine revelation in a class superior to any human literature remains with New-Churchmen alone. It seems to me that the real battle-line for the New Church in this present disturbed age, is in defence of the Bible. All other efforts should be secondary. *The demonstration of the Word of God as inspired revelation incomparably superior to any human literature, is the special task of the New Church.*

As I have already implied, the demonstration of the Word of God as divinely inspired is dependent on the prior proof of the actuality of a spiritual world; not only that, but that that spiritual world is inhabited by intelligent spiritual beings capable at times and under proper conditions of mani-

festing their intelligence to persons living in the flesh in this world. Assuming such demonstration to have been effected by "metapsychics," we may define "inspiration" in its broadest sense as applying to any occurrence wherein the faculties of a living person are so influenced by some spiritual presence that the thoughts uttered or written down at that time by the living person are to be attributed as originating to a greater or a less degree in the influencing spirit rather than in the man himself. This idea of inspiration in the widest sense opens up various lines of investigation. At the present time we shall limit ourselves to a brief consideration of the most significant line for our inquiry,—that line which is commonly called "automatic writing," but by some "inspirational writing."

Omitting the Sacred Scriptures from our immediate consideration, we may say that such writings vary from absolutely worthless productions of illiterate persons of debased natures, to literature worthy of being adjudged of high spirituality and unquestionable worth. The best is of much value and beauty, and truly uplifting. But none of it is to be accepted in an unqualified way as indubitable truth, though generally accepted as such by the human penmen concerned.

All told there is an immense amount of literature that has been produced by automatic writing; and a great quantity of it has come forth of recent years. Perhaps a bit of it that has received the widest publicity of any, and that probably came to the attention of some of you, was the little treatise entitled "Thy Son Liveth"* that was first published some ten or more years ago as a booklet by Little, Brown & Co., and that subsequently appeared in reprinted form in the *Ladies' Home Journal*. At one place in the text of that narrative it was suggested that its readers, one and all, try

*This work is anonymous, and it is conceivable that it may be a bit of fiction. But if so, that fact would in no wise invalidate my general contention; for there is a great quantity of literature that has certainly been produced by automatic writing.

the experiment to see if automatic writing might come through their hands. We of the New Church know that such a suggestion could hardly have emanated from a heavenly source; but it is probable that, because of that prompting, many persons tried the experiment, and that some experienced the desired results. It is unnecessary to specify here other examples of such literature, which as a whole has to be classified under the general heading of Spiritualism. That such writings as a whole have relatively little general agreement on fundamental matters concerning the spiritual world, minimizes their importance as a source of reliable information for any thoughtful person; and the attitude of mind manifested by the larger part of it, is quite sufficient to condemn it in the opinion of any sincere Christian.

Swedenborg himself had sufficient personal experience in automatic writing for him to understand it to the full, and recognize whence the inspiration came in any instance. For example, we find the following passage in his "Adversaria" (3/7167):

> [This revelation] was dictated, but wonderfully in the thought, and the thought was led to the understanding of these words, and the idea was kept fixedly in each of the words, being withheld as it were by a heavenly force; thus this revelation was effected sensibly. . . . It is accomplished otherwise when the thought is manifestly illustrated by a certain light, and the writing is led, so that not a syllable can be written otherwise; sometimes, however, more insensibly, and sometimes so sensibly, that the finger is carried into the writing from above, so that if he wants to write something else he cannot possibly do so; and this not only with an added perception of the thing, but even—as has once and again happened, with variety—without any perception, so that I did not know the series of things until after it had been written. But this very rarely, and only for the sake of the information that such revelations do also take place. But these papers were destroyed, because God Messiah was unwilling for it so to be done, nor was it permitted to dictate anything *viva voce*. Although they had spoken *viva voce* with me almost continuously for so long a time, they were silent while it was being written. Concerning these things . . . it shall be told more fully elsewhere, in order that man

may know how revelations were formerly circumstanced in the primitive Church, afterwards in the representative one, and finally in the symbolic one, so that they may be able to acknowledge that there is not so much as a jot in the books of Moses, of the prophets, and of David, which has not been inspired. . . .

New-Churchmen naturally believe that Swedenborg's personal experiences of a psychic nature were practically all-inclusive, so that his personal knowledge of such things should be adequate for the perfect performance of the function he was chosen for; and to that end it was obviously essential that he should be able to distinguish whatever was written automatically through his hand from whatever was written freely and consciously by himself. In his published theological works nothing of the former was included; but what he put down for print was from the illumination imparted to him by the Lord Himself (or the Holy Spirit) while he read the Word.

The closing sentence from the "Adversaria" quotation above brings us to the consideration of what Swedenborg says elsewhere about the Scriptures. His affirmations with regard to the Word are of a kind that Biblical scholars of the present day uniformly repudiate. You are familiar with what he says,—such statements as these:

In the Word there is a spiritual sense, hitherto unknown.

The sense of the letter of the Word is the basis, the container, and the support of its spiritual and celestial senses. (Doctrine of the Sacred Scripture: Contents.)

The Word of the Old Testament contains arcana of heaven, and each and all things therein regard the Lord, His heaven, the church, faith, and matters of faith. This no mortal gathers from the letter; for from the letter or the sense of the letter no one sees anything more than that in general they regard the externals of the Jewish Church. And yet everywhere there are internal things which do not appear at all in the external, save a very few which the Lord revealed and unfolded to the Apostles. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 1.)

Until recently I have been greatly disturbed by the so-called attainments of modern scholarship in the Biblical field. The evidence for many of the conclusions presented

have seemed adequate or reasonably so; but how reconcile such statements with the affirmations of Swedenborg? If the internal sense of the Word down through the various degrees of meaning from the Lord to man, each continuous within itself, and each corresponding exactly with all the others, finally took shape through the penmen on the earthly plane from fragments put together like a patch-work quilt, the process seemed wholly unworthy of the infinite wisdom and power of the Creator. Respect for both the Lord and His Word could not but be somewhat shaken by any such supposition. But, though I had previously overlooked them, I have recently noticed a number of passages in Swedenborg's Writings that offer a solution for this enigma, and seem to place us in a position where we need have no fear of any valid conclusions of the critical method. One of those passages is found in "Conjugial Love," n. 324,—a memorable relation wherein we are told that in the heavens the ideas of those on a higher plane can hardly be expressed in the spiritual language of the next lower plane, and that the ideas of those in the lowest heaven can hardly be expressed in human words,—which statement naturally seems to imply that the Word as we have it could not have been composed for us through the mediation of the heavens by a stream of influence down through the discrete degrees of the successive spiritual planes from the Lord to man. But best of all such passages that have come to my attention is a short one in the posthumous tractate on the Sacred Scriptures (often called *"De Verbo"* to distinguish it from the "Doctrine of the Sacred Scriptures"), n. 47 of which reads as follows:

I pass over a thousand other experiences by which I have been convinced that the sense of the letter of our Word produces that effect [i.e., of communication with heaven], yea, that the spiritual sense without its companion, the natural sense, does not communicate with heaven. The reason for this is, that the Lord flows in from firsts through ultimates, therefore from Himself into the natural sense of the Word, and from that calls forth, or evolves, its spiritual and celestial senses, and thus enlightening, teaches and

leads the angels; wherefore the Lord is called in the Word the First and the Last.

Speaking of the prophetical writings in the Old Testament, Swedenborg says:

> The words are such as are in the prophet, thus are according to his apprehension, and according to the form in which they are seated in him, which is the cause of the very diverse styles of the prophets. . . . But this I can sacredly asseverate—who am inspired—that there is not the least of a word, there is not a jot, which is not inspired; but it is varied a little, according to the gift of him who sets the thing forth; but still so that even then there is not a jot which is not inspired. (Adversaria, 3/6965.)

The following passage from the "Spiritual Diary" is also significant in this connection:

> That many things are effected upon earth immediately [from the Lord] is evident from the case of the apostles, who sometimes, when they spoke, were inspired by the Holy Spirit, and the words which they should speak were given to them, which was immediate inspiration. Nevertheless the Lord desires that all things, even to the minutest particulars, should flow according to order, so that they should proceed, as it were, of their own accord. (Spiritual Diary, n. 1509.)

I understand these passages to mean that the various books of the Word as originally given by the Lord were directly and immediately inspired by the Lord to the least detail, and that this inspiration involved the exact words used by the human penman, and the exact form and order of those words, though the work was done by the writers as though of themselves, using such material as they thought appropriate at the time. While we need not deny the possibility of the production of the Word by the Lord through the mediation of the heavens, the teaching in the passages just quoted, namely, that the Lord inspired the letter of the Word immediately and without any mediation through the heavens, seems to me to clear the theory of verbal inspiration from most, if not all, of its difficulties. The minds of the penmen involved were to some extent a complicating factor, but not to the extent of invalidating in the slightest

degree what was imparted by the direct inspiration of the Lord. Human language had to be used, and the minds and brains of living men; but this was no limitation upon the power of Him who created both,—that is, both innate human faculties and acquired human language. That may strike you as a novel idea,—that human language has been given, was created by the Lord; but in view of our teachings as to the Divine Providence we can assume no other theory; and the spiritual history of humanity as outlined in Swedenborg's Writings confirms that fact. For, while mankind in the Garden of Eden state of its existence did not have or need verbal language as an instrument of converse, but individuals then enjoyed communication by thought transference not only among themselves but also consciously from those on the spiritual plane who were associated with them, the interiors of men's minds became closed to such influx during the process of the Fall, and finally (though traces of the earlier method of communication have remained with a small minority even down to our own day) the only method of communication generally experienced and believed in was that external one consisting of spoken words, or their still more external written symbols. Our whole lives on earth are so bound up with the use of language that we rarely give thought to how wonderful it is; but from a philosophic standpoint, like everything else, it is full of mystery. Each of us has to learn to speak; and mainly by means of spoken words we receive guidance and instruction from our parents and others; and by means of human accomplishments as recorded mainly by written language, one generation stands on the shoulders of that which preceded, and in turn serves the next in the same way,—the progress of industrial civilization in outward ways, especially since the dawning of our New Age, abundantly testifying to the truth of this statement. So important is language in this way, and its use is so spontaneous, that we rarely think that it has a still more important use.

But we are taught that the fundamental purpose of lan-

guage as a gift to fallen mankind was not that it might serve merely as an aid for the instruction of children by parents and others, as an instrument for intercommunication on the human plane, as a device for man's conquest of his material surroundings, but that it might serve as a means whereby the Lord could communicate with his finite children in the flesh, in this most external, this kindergarten state of their existence, and instruct them in most essential ways. In short, when in the course of the history of humanity the need arose, language was given to man primarily so that the Lord could Himself communicate directly with man, and man could understand. Let us not be unmindful of this astounding fact, that language, especially in that ultimate form of the written word, and that still more ultimate form of the printed word, is the Lord's means of instructing His finite children concerning the things most important for them to know,—most important for them to read, study, and inwardly digest in order to attain unto salvation for their immortal souls.

Man's use of language is primarily literal,—i.e., each man uses words with the meanings he and others ordinarily associate with them. While there are figurative and fanciful uses of language, the highest ranges of significance in the use of language by man is found in the imaginative productions of the great poets. Human literature can go no further; and if the Bible manifested no higher use of language than that found in human literature, we should have to adjudge it as a purely finite human production, to which the word "inspiration" could be applied only in a minor sense. But the Writings of Swedenborg assure us that those portions of the Bible that veritably constitute the Word of God contain a hidden sense, an inner sense, that is strictly continuous throughout each part, that is coherent throughout the entire Word, and that manifests one mind at work in the production of each and every part. The Lord's use of language,—whatever is inspired by His Holy Spirit,—always involves this inner sense.

According to Swedenborg, the relationship existing between the literal sense of human terms and the spiritual sense within those terms when they are used as the Lord uses them, is known as "correspondence"; and the Word of the Lord has been written throughout in the language of correspondences. A few years before the opening of his spiritual senses, and before he began his intensive study of the Sacred Scriptures, Swedenborg had become aware of the correspondences existing between certain phenomena of physical nature and certain things of a spiritual nature, and about 1744 he embodied his speculations along this line in a treatise, never published by him, but which appeared in Latin in 1784, and in English in 1792, with the title "An Hieroglyphic Key to Natural and Spiritual Mysteries, by Way of Representations and Correspondences." There is excellent evidence here of the influence of the Holy Spirit in illuminating Swedenborg's mind preparatory to later developments, when through illustration imparted by the Holy Spirit while he was reading the Word, Swedenborg came to a full understanding of the science of correspondences as embodied in that Word. He asserts that this knowledge came to him not through the instrumentality of any finite mentalities, but through the Lord alone while he was reading the Word. Better than any man had ever known before, he came to know the inner sense of the Word, and to appreciate its Divinity.

There is excellent evidence that men of high spirituality throughout the ages have sensed that the Sacred Scriptures manifest qualities not to be found elsewhere in literature. These qualities they have attributed to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit; and the literature manifesting it they have esteemed as Divine revelation, as information with infinitely precious content imparted by the Lord to His earthly children for their spiritual guidance to the heavenly life. Even before the incarnation of our Lord the actuality of a spiritual content was traditional with the Jews, though perhaps given no greater credence at that time than at the present.

But the incarnate Lord by his life and words demonstrated that inner content to all His disciples, and to all humanity so far as it has ears to hear. You know the significant passages of Scripture bearing upon this affirmation. Here are some of them:

> If ye believed Moses, ye would believe me; for he wrote of me. (John v, 46.)
>
> And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself. (Luke xxiv, 27.)
>
> With many such parables spake he the word unto them, as they were able to hear it; and without a parable spake he not unto them; but privately to his own disciples he expounded all things. (Mark iv, 33-34.)

It is obvious that these sentences evidence that, apart from any general recognition of such a sense among the Jews of His time, Jesus Christ Himself asserted that the Old Testament held an inner sense; and that through His instruction, if in no other way, His Apostles had some knowledge of this sense. That the Apostles transmitted some information along this line to the early Church Fathers; and that those Fathers attempted to expound that sense as they surmised it might be; and that the method of figurative interpretation has had traditional justification ever since, though under a cloud among Protestants subsequent to the Reformation, there is abundant evidence. Such evidence is found summarized in a notable book but recently published, namely, "A New Commentary on Holy Scripture" (1928), of which the editor-in-chief was Bishop Charles Gore, D.D. Another summary in pamphlet form, prepared expressly for the use of New-Churchmen by the Rev. J. F. Buss, has but just come from the press under the title "The Age-long Tradition of a Spiritual Interpretation of Sacred Scripture."

Turning now to Gore's Commentary, we find that, whereas such a notable commentary as Peake's, which appeared in 1919, repudiates the legitimacy of the figurative

interpretation of Scripture, and inveighs against allegorical interpretation as such, the editors of Gore's Commentary, while not unanimous in favoring any interpretation other than the literal, yet as a whole do favor and speak emphatically concerning the actuality and the value of deeper meanings. For instance, on page 695 of the first part of the volume we find the following, from the pen of Darwell Stone, D.D.:

> This [mystical] interpretation [of Scripture] is closely bound up with the permanent value of the Old Testament. If the Old Testament is to fulfil its purpose as "written for our admonition" (I Cor. x, 11), something much more than its merely literal and historical meaning is needed. Many difficulties about Holy Scripture have been in part due to an effect produced by retaining the theory of verbal inspiration which the fathers held, and rejecting the coordinate theory of mystical interpretation by which it was lightened. The interpretation is suggested also by the authority of the New Testament; for there is nothing in the more moderate use of it which goes beyond the methods used by St. Paul and in the First Gospel. It is in harmony with the analogy of nature and grace. It recognizes that the same God spoke in the Old Testament as in the New Testament and in Christian times. It sees in our Lord One who sums up in Himself all that is best in human life wherever presented, and in the Christian Church that supernatural people of God to which the divinely chosen nation of Israel led.
>
> Moreover, it affords the justification for the reading of the Old Testament and the recitation of the psalter in Christian worship. . . . In the judgment of the present writer, the Church is not likely to be able to retain the reading of the Old Testament and the recitation of the psalter in public worship unless the use of mystical interpretation is to some extent recognized. Those who in recent years have assailed the public use of particular lessons and particular psalms have failed to see what the problem really is.
>
> This is not to say that the use of the mystical interpretation has never passed into abuse, that there have never been exaggerations. . . . But here, as so often, the abuse does not destroy the possibility of rightful use. If such interpretation may run wild and be unreasonable when not held in due restraint, it possesses, when properly handled such real spiritual value as might be expected from the use of it in the New Testament and its place in the tradition of the Church. . . .

To the essay by Dr. Stone from which I have just quoted, there is an "appended note" in similar vein from the pen of Charles Harris, D.D., in which occurs the following passage.

> All this method of mystical interpretation, whether Hellenic, Jewish, or Christian, is alien and repellant to the modern mind. But it requires more consideration than it has recently received. . . . When we pass [from mythology, legends, etc.] to consider the action of the inspiring Spirit of God, especially in the Old Testament, we are faced with the fact that myth and symbol and legend and ceremony have been as truly the subject or vehicle for inspiration as history or prophecy. Again, the love songs of *The Canticles* were admitted into the canon because they were mystically interpreted as reflecting the mutual love of Jehovah and Israel. And no one can deny that from Hosea downward this is an admitted truth. "This mystery is great: but I speak concerning Christ and His Church." All these considerations seem to point to the need for a fresh treatment of mystical interpretation which shall distinguish between its arbitrary and its rational use. (P. 697.)

To me it seems likely that those utterances on mystical interpretation in a book that will probably have very wide circulation may produce a profound effect, and help turn the tide of inquiry in a direction that in due time may bring Swedenborg directly under the spotlight. For what is meant here by the mystical sense of Scripture is, in a measure at least, what Swedenborg means by the inner sense and the spiritual sense, as he expressly states in the following words:

> The mystic things which some seek in the Word are nothing else but the spiritual and celestial senses. (Sacred Scripture, post., n. 21e.)
>
> The mystical element of the Word is nothing else than that which its internal or spiritual sense contains, which treats of the Lord, of His kingdom, and of the church, and not of the natural things which are in the world. (Heavenly Doctrine, n. 258.)
>
> The Jews and also some Christians believe indeed that in these, and also in the rest of the passages of the Word, there is some meaning stored up, which they call mystical—the reason of the belief being that an idea of holiness in regard to the Word has been impressed upon them from early childhood; but when it is

inquired what that mystical meaning is, they do not know. If they are told that because the Word is Divine, this meaning must necessarily be such as is in heaven among the angels; and that no other mystical meaning can exist in the Word, or if so, that it would be either fabulous or magical or idolatrous; and furthermore that this mystical meaning which is in heaven among the angels, is nothing else than what is called the spiritual and celestial senses, and treats solely of the Lord, of His kingdom, and of the church, consequently of good and truth; and that if they knew what good and truth, or what faith and love, are, they would be able to know that meaning—when this is told them, scarce any one believes it; nay, in such ignorance at the present day are they who are of the church, that what is related concerning the celestial and spiritual is scarcely comprehensible to them. Be it so; nevertheless since it has been granted me by the Divine mercy of the Lord to be at the same time in heaven as a spirit and on earth as a man, and accordingly to speak with angels, and this now continually for several years, I cannot do otherwise than open those things of the Word which are called mystical, that is, its interiors, which are the spiritual and celestial things of the Lord's kingdom. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 4923[3].)

That an adequate knowledge of the inner sense of Scripture furnishes a practical demonstration of its Holiness, is asserted by Swedenborg in the opening chapter of his "Doctrine concerning the Sacred Scripture," wherein we read:

Lest, therefore, man should be in doubt whether the Word is such [Divine Truth], its internal sense has been revealed to me by the Lord, which in its essence is spiritual, and is within the external sense which is natural, as the soul is in the body. That sense is the spirit which gives life to the letter; it can therefore bear witness to the Divinity and sanctity of the Word, and *can convince even the natural man, if he is willing to be convinced.* (N. 4.)

Elsewhere Swedenborg informs us that the Bible as a whole is not the Word of God; but those parts are which were written in accordance with the law of correspondences, and which have a continuous internal sense. He tells us what parts of the Bible are not parts of the Word of God. Those parts which constitute the Word of God were

written by human penmen at intervals during long centuries,—penmen who could not have been aware that through inspiration of the Holy Spirit they were setting down language embodying correspondences throughout, and thereby evidencing one infinite and ever present mind at work in the resulting productions from first to last. That is where inspiration of the highest type, true inspiration, came in; that is where true revelation to humanity came in. To such writings,—written by inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and embodying correspondences throughout,—Swedenborg applied the designation "the Word of the Lord"; and his use of the term "Word" implies the inappropriateness of designating any other writings whatsoever by that term. His own Writings are revelations, and were inspired by the Lord, but in a different way not involving complete control by the Holy Spirit, and therefore not embodying correspondences. While the Word of the Lord was imparted by direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit, Swedenborg's Writings were penned with full activity of his own faculties under illumination or illustration from that Spirit. On the one hand we have the work of the Infinite Mind of the Lord speaking throughout in parables; on the other we have the work of an illumined finite mind speaking in the sense of the letter. No matter what the Writings of Swedenborg contain, the difference between those Writings and the Word of the Lord is absolute.

To make known the mystical sense of Scripture, not by intellectual ingenuity in allegorical ways, by systematically through knowledge of the science of correspondences,—by which it is made evident that everything of that deeper sense has reference to the Lord and to His Kingdom in the heavens and in His Church on earth,—was the special function of Swedenborg as revelator. His Writings have demonstrated the Divinity of the Word of the Lord, and will in due time save the Bible from the discard threatened by modern Biblical scholarship. As New-Churchmen we should be loyal to Swedenborg's teachings in his Writings,

and should seek as full knowledge as possible of the Lord's Word, both in its literal and in its spiritual sense.

I have said that, in my opinion, the demonstration of the Word of God as Divine revelation, and its re-establishment as such in the esteem of the Christian Church, is the special task of the New Church. The following passage from Swedenborg supports this contention:

> Since it was foretold that at the end of this [the first Christian] church also, darkness would arise, owing to the want of knowledge and acknowledgment of the Lord as the God of heaven and earth, and owing to the separation of faith from charity, lest the genuine understanding of the Word should thereby perish, therefore it has pleased the Lord now to reveal the spiritual sense of the Word, and to make manifest that the Word in that sense, and from it in the natural sense, treats of the Lord and of the church, and indeed of them alone; and many other things, also, by means of which the light of truth from the Word, almost extinguished, may be restored. (Doctrine concerning the Sacred Scripture, n. 112.)

How this light may be restored is indicated by other passages, such as the following:

> Not the Word, but the understanding of it, makes the church . . . for the letter without the understanding of it is dead. . . . The Lord is present with a man by the reading of the Word, but is conjoined with him by the understanding of truth from the Word; and according to this understanding, and as far as the Lord is conjoined with a man, so far the church is in the man. The church is in a man; the church which is outside of him is the church with the many who have the church in them. . . . In many places in the prophets, the understanding of the Word is treated of; and it is taught that the church is only where the Word is rightly understood, and that the church is such in quality as is the understanding of the Word with those who are in it. (*Ibid.*, nn. 76-79.)
>
> The Word is not understood but by means of doctrine from the Word. . . . There is in the Word a spiritual sense, which is called the internal sense. . . . The internal sense is the very doctrine of the church. Those who understand the Word according to the internal sense, understand the true doctrine itself of the church, because the internal sense contains it. (Heavenly Doctrine, nn. 257-260.)

I hold that such passages as these emphasize the need of the preaching of the internal sense in our churches, and the

need of doctrinal sermons; not, however, in crude, undigested form, but in a manner evidencing a truly regenerated spirit in our ministry. Let our ministers cease following the example of the world in announcing sermon subjects, and let them announce instead, if they will, the texts of Scripture they intend to expound. And let New-Church sermons everywhere be, not like the sermons of Old-Church ministers, but of a sort that cannot be duplicated anywhere except by those preaching in the light derived from the Lord through the illumined writings of Emanuel Swedenborg.

BENJAMIN A. WHITTEMORE.

THE AMERICAN NEW CHURCH IN THE FOREIGN FIELD

By Philip M. Alden

DURING recent years there has apparently been a change in the attitude of New-Church people in America toward missionary work, which has been reflected in the increased activity of the Board of Home and Foreign Missions. This is a most important and encouraging sign. I believe it is a fact, however, that in the broad sense the New Church has never been a missionary Church. Perhaps that is one reason why we have not grown.

Our Lord Jesus, in one of his last meetings with his disciples, said:

> Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. (Matt. xxviii, 19, 20.)

Should not that command mean just as much to us today as it did to those first disciples? Can it not apply equally well to the establishment in the world of the New Christian Church, which we believe is now descending from God out of heaven, as to the first Christian Church?

We cannot reverently read the Gospels and the Book of Acts without being impressed by the fact that it was this earnest missionary spirit, this intense desire to bring truth to those who walked in darkness, which made possible the remarkable growth of the early Christian Church. The disciples were fired with the firm conviction that the true purpose of their life could only be fulfilled by telling others of their wonderful discovery, that Jesus had come into the world to save all men. To them it was the most important thing in life, the only thing worth living for.

It is an odd, but indisputable fact, that opposition often aids growth and progress. Certainly this was so with the work of the early missionaries. During this first era the Christian Church grew as no religion had ever done before, or ever will again. Today religious intolerance and oppression are almost unknown; so it is perfectly natural that there should have been a reaction. However, something of this missionary spirit is apparently still retained in other churches. The Methodists, for example, are active today in many missionary fields; and it is of interest to note that their recorded membership in the United States increased from 5,832,000 in 1916 to 7,754,000 in 1928. It is also significant to read the following, from a report of the last Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America:

> The Convention gave a remarkable evidence of its support of the National Council's broad program in behalf of missions, religious education, and social service. The budget provides for $4,225,680 a year for three years for the general work of the Church at home and abroad, in addition to $3,000,000 that will be raised for new equipment in the mission field. In addition the Convention in one of its most interesting discussions met the request of the veteran lay medical missionary, Dr. Rudolph S. Teusler of Japan, by agreeing to raise $1,000,000, in addition to $1,500,000 being raised by a national committee, in the interest of St. Luke's Hospital, Tokyo.
>
> The Convention decided to throw itself heart and soul into the cause of evangelism on a national plane. The followers of the Wesleys who left the Church of England two centuries ago, largely because it was so luke-warm on the side of evangelism, would have been greatly pleased to note the unanimity and enthusiasm which have come into the Church as a result of the recent Bishop's Crusade, the purpose of which is to revive a sense of responsibility among clergy and laymen alike for the extension of the Kingdom of God.

There are perhaps several very good reasons why the New Church has been less active than other Christian churches in missionary work. In the first place, we are a relatively small organization, and therefore our financial capacity is limited. To do really effective mission work

requires ample funds, to which the report of the Episcopalian Convention bears witness. In addition, we know that the truth of the Lord's New Church is being given to man by direct influx from Him through the angels, in proportion as he uses the means provided. And last, but perhaps most important, at least as regards missionary work among non-Christian peoples, we know that anyone who lives the life of charity in love to the Lord, regardless of his religion, is making his place in heaven. We do not share the belief once held by our friends in other Christian churches, that the heathen are eternally condemned, for we read in "Heaven and Hell":

> It is a common opinion that those born out of the Church, who are called heathen or gentiles, cannot be saved, because they have not the Word and thus do not know the Lord, and without the Lord there is no salvation. But still it may be known that they also are saved, from this alone, that the mercy of the Lord is universal, that is, toward everyone, that they are born men as well as those within the Church who are respectively few, and that it is not their fault that they do not know the Lord. (N. 318.)
>
> I have learned in many ways that Gentiles who have led a moral life in obedience and subordination, and have lived in mutual charity according to their religion, and have thus received something of conscience, are accepted in the other life and are there instructed with solicitous care by angels in the goods and truths of faith, and that when they are being instructed they behave themselves modestly, intelligently and wisely, and easily receive truths and adopt them. (N. 321.)

And from the Gospel of Luke:

> Then shall they come from the east and the west, from the north and the south, and shall sit down in the Kingdom of God. And behold there are last who shall be first, and there are first who shall be last. (Luke xiii, 29, 30.)

Even granting, however, that our reasons for being less active in this work are sound, it is a very real question as to whether or not this attitude is a wise one from the point of view of our own Church organization. But now, apparently, this attitude is gradually changing. Our Church *is*

expanding her missionary work from year to year, and we are finding that peoples almost everywhere are interested in the truth that we can bring to them. Even a casual study of the work actually being done by the American New Church in Foreign Fields, indicates that a start has been made. It is thrilling to think what the future may hold in store, particularly as the missionary spirit becomes more universal and more energetic here at home, and we come to a fuller realization of the work before us.

Statistics are sometimes misleading, and often dull; but the growth of our interest in missionary work is well illustrated by a comparison of reports for the years 1917-1918 and 1927-1928. In the former period the General Convention, through the Board of Home and Foreign Missions, was supporting mission work in five fields outside the United States, and had an annual budget of about $12,000. In 1927-28 a total of sixteen missionary ministers were receiving whole or partial financial support; the French and German speaking Federations of the New Church on the continent of Europe had been organized; and the budget of the Board had increased to an annual figure of $28,700, or over one hundred and twenty-five per cent in ten years. In addition there has recently been received word of interest in the New Church in several places which are not as yet receiving support. As a matter of fact I believe I am correct in saying that the field of activity of the Board of Missions is limited almost entirely by financial considerations.

It will perhaps be of interest to sketch briefly the way in which the truths of the New Church have been received in countries outside our own, and the progress and development during the last decade. With one or two notable exceptions, the work has been started and, with our financial aid, is being carried on by people native to the field in which they are working. The first call has come from them, and we have merely tried to help as best we might. But it has not all been easy. There have been difficulties to overcome. As one of our missionaries has expressed it:

It seems to me one year does not mean much in the life and work of a missionary. Although he must be busy day by day, he does not see always satisfactory enough results of his activity. Nevertheless, he must continue his work with great patience and steadiness. I remember very often the beautiful hopes at the beginning of my activity, expecting that every man who would hear or read the wonderful Heavenly Doctrines would be inspired by them, and accept them with a great joy as the message from the Heavenly Father. I thought it would be necessary only to proclaim the Doctrines, and a great multitude of people would gather around the place where these doctrines were proclaimed. But my experience has shown me otherwise. During my public lectures in the Russian church here, I noted very often that the people who were present listened with attention when I have been speaking about the life after death; but when I said that Jesus Christ is the Only God of heaven and earth, that we all are sinners and must repent of our sins, that we all must live according to the precepts of the Decalogue—many of my listeners turned back and went away from the worship room. I remember frequently the topic of one lecture of the late President J. K. Smyth: "Heroism in the Spreading of the New Church." Verily, the missionary must have such heroism, and he can receive it from the Lord alone. Notwithstanding difficulties, however, steady progress has been made.

The missionary work of our Church divides itself naturally into three major fields,—the European, the South American, and the Far Eastern.* Let us consider first our missionary work in Europe.

*Although throughout this paper I have limited my comments to those fields in which the Board of Home and Foreign Missions of the General Convention of the New Jerusalem in America is interested, no survey of New-Church missionary activities would be complete without at least some mention of the work being done by the British Conference of the New Church, and by the General Church of the New Jerusalem. The British Conference is in close touch with the New Church in Australia; and it has a most encouraging mission with the native people in South Africa, this being probably the largest New-Church missionary group in the world, with an estimated membership of over 3,300. The Conference is also assisting financially the work in Copenhagen, Prague, Zürich, Libau, Valencia, Berlin, and British Guiana, as well as the activity of the French Federation and of the Swedenborg Society of India. As regards the missionary work of the

Spain.—In Valencia, Spain, we find evidence of an interest in the New Church, which was apparently quite active in 1918, under the leadership of Messrs. J. H. Anderson and S. Peg. Ordeix. A little magazine called *The Herald of the New Church* was being published; and it was hoped that these could later be bound and used for mission purposes. Mr. Anderson was handicapped, however, because he was working almost single-handed; and due to the strong Catholic influence in Spain, those who were interested in the New Church feared to support it openly. As a result the years 1918-28 have been spent principally in translation work, and in publishing *The Herald*. In the fall of 1927 and spring of 1928, Mr. George C. Warren visited the New-Church friends there, and later told the Board of Missions about his visit, and his interest in helping to develop and assist the group. As a result of this contact the Board recently voted to pay one-half the expense of sending a representative from the British Conference to aid in establishing definite work for the New Church in Spain.

Denmark.—In Copenhagen, Denmark, Rev. S. C. Brönniche was lecturing in 1918, using J. Howard Spalding's "Kingdom of Heaven as Seen by Swedenborg." He was also editing a modest paper, and interesting his friends in the truths of the Church; and a small Church society and Sunday school had been organized.

Mr. Brönniche's work was not limited to Denmark, for we find him lecturing in the cities of Christiana and Stravenger in Norway, and communicating with an interested family in Iceland. He seemed to believe at this time that the field for the New Church in Norway was more promising than in Denmark. Nevertheless in 1920 he was working on a Danish translation of "True Christian Religion."

News of the formation of an International League reached Copenhagen in 1923, and Mr. Brönniche then or-

---

Academy, I understand that they also have a large mission in Africa, as well as one in Rio de Janeiro, and no doubt in other fields.

ganized his young people. He also published and placed on sale three thousand copies of "True Christian Religion"; and one of the most prominent papers in Copenhagen published an article on "Swedenborg and the True Christian Religion," which led to many inquiries, and was most helpful in attracting attention to the New Church.

By 1924 the membership of the Copenhagen League had increased to ten; and five new members had been received into the Society. During this year Mr. Brönniche again made a trip to Norway, but found the interest in religion less than during the war period. The year 1926 was a notable one for the Copenhagen Society, because during it they were able to acquire a place of worship of their own. One of the mortgages on the property, however, occasioned trouble, which was relieved in 1928 through a loan from the General Convention. The outlook for the future is encouraging for more useful work in a broader field. The Copenhagen Society has grown slowly during the last ten years. There have been times when conditions were difficult, and the future uncertain; nevertheless steady progress has been made, and many have learned of Swedenborg and the doctrines of the New Church through printed publications, and Danish translations of his works.

Switzerland.—Turning next to German Switzerland, where missionary work was undertaken fifty years ago, the New-Church Society in Zürich was well established in 1918, under the leadership of Rev. A. L. Goerwitz, who was preaching regularly to one hundred and thirteen members in Zürich, Berne and Herisau.

One of the difficulties under which almost all of our missionaries have been, and in many cases still are working, is the lack of suitable translations of Swedenborg's works and other New-Church literature. Mr. Goerwitz was handicapped particularly just after the war because of the shortage of satisfactory books in German and French. The printed page has played a wonderful part in the spread of Christianity throughout the world; and it is apparent that it

will be equally, if not more, important in spreading the doctrine of the Second Coming. Because of their realization of this, we find many of our missionary ministers spending an appreciable part of their time on translation and publication work, usually to the full extent of the funds available.

The Swiss New-Church Union was organized in Zürich in the summer of 1920; and at the same time the first Conference of New-Church Ministers on the Continent of Europe was held. Later in the same year Mr. Goerwitz gave public lectures in Berne, charging fees of one-half or one franc, and having regularly an interested audience of from one hundred to one hundred and fifty.

In his report for 1923 Mr. Goerwitz says (referring principally to the New Church in Switzerland):

> The growth is a slow one; still there are new comers in all places where I hold services. But it takes a long time to decide to unite with the Church, which is not so inviting in countries where there is a State Church, and where, therefore, the non-conformist sects are somewhat despised.

To us living in a country where religious freedom is a matter of course, such a statement sounds strange; but it is a serious factor in the growth of the organized New Church in many of the countries in which our missionaries are now working.

By 1924 the membership of the three societies in Zürich, Berne, and Herisau, had increased from 113 to 128; and there have since been further increases. We may rest assured that the work of the New Church in German-speaking Switzerland is in able hands, and gives promise of steady and consistent growth.

Closely allied with the German-speaking New-Church organization of Switzerland is the Federation of French-speaking Societies, with principal centres of activity in Geneva, Lausanne, and Paris. The first organized work for the Church in Geneva and Lausanne was started by Rev. Gustave Regamey in 1918, and extended rapidly. The

Paris Society was re-organized by Rev. F. C. Mercanton in 1923. Mr. Regamey's sons, Alfred and Antony, joined him in 1924, and Alfred is still working in that field. With the help of his sons Mr. Regamey was able to extend his work rapidly. The Federation soon thereafter welcomed a small society in Charantaise under Mr. Flon, and another in the Island of Mauritius under the leadership of Mr. Bécherel.

The French Federation has organized a missionary board and a board of publication, which has established book depots in Lausanne and Geneva, and taken over the publication of the *Messenger of the New Church*. The circulation of this little magazine is increasing, and it is apparently helpful. The Mission Board is also sending out some one hundred and thirty copies of a weekly sermon, many of these going to isolated receivers. It is doing "follow-up" work on book sales, similar to that being done in this country. A new society has recently been organized in Strasbourg. There are now about one hundred and forty-five active members in the French Federation.

Sweden.—Let us turn our thoughts next to the Society in Stockholm, Sweden, which was thirty years old in 1918, and was holding regular services under the leadership of Rev. C. J. N. Manby, with an average attendance of 46. This society had apparently shown little growth since its inception; but in 1919 they first tried advertising a special service, with the result that the attendance jumped to 115. Mr. Manby was also publishing a monthly paper, and working on the translation of the Writings into Swedish.

In 1920 Mr. Manby was taken to the spiritual world; and Mr. David Rundström, who had been studying for the ministry, took his place. Soon thereafter we find Mr. Rundström holding regular services in Stockholm, Gotenburg, and Malmo, as well as lecturing before audiences of 450 in the first two cities, and of 50 to 100 in smaller places. He finds it difficult to increase the membership of the Church, however, because (as he says) "the people are in the hands of their religious leaders." He finds that the

educated people with whom he comes in contact are more open-minded to new truth, but also more agnostic.

In 1924 a striking and radical innovation was introduced into the life and customs of the New Church in Sweden. The societies granted the ladies the right to vote, in spite of strong opposition on the part of some members. It is significant, however, that the Church grew rapidly after the change, adding over one new member each month. The actual increase in registered members in the year 1924-25 was twenty-two.

A summer New-Church home was opened in 1925 on the islands of Stockholm, to provide vacation facilities for Church members at relatively small expense. This proved to be very successful, and aided in securing three new members, and requests for membership from several others, who, however, had not been able to arrange to leave the State Church.

Without question 1926 marked an important milestone for the New Church in Sweden. In this year the erection of the Swedenborg Memorial Church was definitely decided upon, and work was started. The increase in Church membership in this period was also encouraging; and everything seemed to be favorable for the dedication of the Memorial Church the following summer. The consecration service took place on Sept. 4, 1927. The edifice has served to bring the New Church in Sweden from obscurity to a leading part in the religious life of Stockholm. Since the dedication of this church, the attendance at services has markedly increased, although no special advertising has been done. The outlook for the future is most encouraging.

Czecho-Slovakia.—We turn next to Czecho-Slovakia, that war-created country in Central Europe, bounded by Germany, Austria, Hungary, Roumania, and Poland. Here in 1920, in the old capital city of Prague, Mr. J. I. Janacek was working out plans for the organization of the New Church, and founding the "Swedenborgian Free Corps—Christian Life" for those who accepted the doctrines but

did not intend at the time to join the Church. He also founded a Swedenborg Fund to care for finances, to which there were about fifty contributors; and he published numerous journals and tracts, principally from his own translations. And to do all this he had only his Sundays and evenings available.

The following year, however, Mr. Janacek was ordained a minister of the New Church; and after that event he was enabled to devote his entire time to missionary work. In this year he finished the translation of the "Last Judgment," his fifth volume; and it was published, as previous books had been, principally by local subscriptions.

Mr. Janacek found that the name "New Church" proved confusing with the new Czecho-Slovakian people; and in addition the spiritualists, anti-militarists, and followers of Tolstoi, had combined, and were established in Prague under the name "New Jerusalem." As a result, he called his church "Swedenborg's New Church." He was able to lecture once before one hundred and fifty people; but due to opposition from the Protestant pastors, the use of the hall used on that occasion was later denied him. In spite of this the truth was spreading rapidly. He was publishing one thousand to two thousand copies of his paper, and had interested people in Roumania, Bulgaria, and Jugo-Slavia, as well as in Czecho-Slovakia.

In 1924, however, through the courtesy of the Episcopal Council of the Czecho-Slovak Church in Prague, he was able to secure the use of the famous old St. Niklas Cathedral for Thursday evenings. His congregation at these services was from fifty to one hundred; and the distribution of tracts and the sale of books increased.

As Mr. Janacek's work has progressed, he has been encouraged in his printing and publishing efforts by the way in which this work has been supported. He also notes that some of the doctrines of the New Church are being preached from the pulpits of the old churches; and that it

is evident that the Writings have had a considerable influence on the minds of their pastors.

In his Sunday-school work Mr. Janacek expresses a need to which we in America are not blind. To quote from one of his reports:

> Allow me to remark here that I miss very hard a suitable New-Church manual for the Sunday-school teacher, showing how he may teach the young people to live according to the doctrines.

The year 1927 was an important one for the New Church in Czecho-Slovakia, because in it they secured their own place of worship, in quite an ideal building which also provides space for printing and publishing work. Early in 1928 Mr. Janacek arranged for a Czechish edition of Helen Keller's "My Religion," translated by himself.

Reading Mr. Janacek's reports, one cannot but feel that the work of our Church in the Central European Countries is progressing, and with the Lord's help will be a bearer of truth to many who are seeking it.

Germany.—Turning next to Berlin and Vienna we find Rev. Eric Reissner, who was installed by Mr. Goerwitz in 1922. His coming meant much to the New-Church people in these cities; and a short time later a third society was organized in Bochun-Herne, the three societies uniting to form "The German New Church."

Mr. Reissner soon found that, although the organized societies in Berlin and Vienna were relatively small, thirty and forty members respectively, there was a good deal of interest in Swedenborg throughout Germany. One of his first efforts was to establish Sunday schools, which helped to bring new life to the societies. The year after the Berlin school was organized, twenty-one new members were added; and the following year there were twenty-seven new members. This would be considered good by even the largest of our societies here in America.

Berlin and Vienna being some 350 miles apart, Mr. Reissner found it difficult to give his best attention to both societies; and consequently in 1927 the Board of Missions

suggested that the number of visits to Vienna be reduced. The result of this was a decreased membership in Vienna, but a very marked increase in Berlin. We can think of this society as flourishing; and it will quite possibly soon be the largest New-Church group on the continent.

Latvia.—The last of the fields of missionary activity in Europe which is sufficiently large to warrant special mention is that in Latvia, centering in the city of Libau.

The first printed record of the work in Libau is found in the reports for the year 1922-23, although I believe Mr. Grosch had been active prior to that time, for we find him in 1923 preaching regularly in both Lettish and German, and organizing a young people's league. He had also made possible the sale of all available copies of "Heaven and Hell," and had opened a small lending library in Riga. By 1925 he reports one hundred and ten members. He feels that the work of the Church is going forward steadily though slowly; but he emphasizes the need of additional funds for what he terms "propaganda."

Recently there have been some internal difficulties in the work in Libau; and the Board of Missions has extended support only provisionally, depending upon reorganization and continued activity for the New Church. Mr. Goerwitz has been asked to visit Libau, and advise concerning conditions there, so that the work can be supported in the best way in the future.

British Guiana.—It is a long trip from Lettland to British Guiana, but one we can quickly make in our thoughts. This little South American country has long been the seat of one of our most interesting missions, the original New-Church movement dating back to efforts of James Glen in 1784. In 1918 Rev. F. A. Wiltshire reported forty-three registered members of the New Church, with a League of twenty and a Sunday school of twenty-two. There were many hardships, one of the most important of which was the fact that the mission was not recognized by the governor

of the colony, and consequently Mr. Wiltshire could not become a marriage officer.

In addition to the work with his regular society in Georgetown, Mr. Wiltshire reported that many visited his mission from time to time, and went away pleased with the Heavenly Doctrines. He also acted as substitute minister in three other churches, where he was well received; and at each place the doctrines were much appreciated, the people calling it "new light."

In 1922 the Georgetown Society suffered a great loss through Mr. Wiltshire's death. His parishioners carried on throughout the year, however; and the Sunday school started its building fund, with a program calling for $15.00 a month for five years.

Rev. J. B. Spiers visited British Guiana in the winter of 1924-25, and baptized forty-three members. His visit did much to encourage these people; and when Rev. W. F. Fraser returned from study in our Theological School, he found an active and interested group of people awaiting him. In November of the same year Mr. Fraser was appointed a marriage officer; and the New Church was officially recognized by the government. There were one hundred at the Thanksgiving Service; and the Sunday school increased its membership to thirty-nine.

In the following year a new custom was established,—that of having annual missionary meetings to which all were invited; and the Moravian, Congregationlist, and Seventh Day Adventist ministers were on the platform. Mr. Fraser reports a large and appreciative audience, and a collection of $7.77, which was good considering the poor economic conditions then prevailing. British Guiana is largely dependent upon its rice and sugar crops, and these had been affected by a prolonged drought.

The Society has long needed a regular place of worship; and it must therefore have been a source of great satisfaction to these people when the Board of Missions last year authorized the purchase for $3500 of a tract of land known

as the Wiltshire property. In addition the British Conference had been asked to take active charge of their building fund.

Dutch Guiana.—Dutch Guiana is a neighboring country, in which, prior to Mr. Spier's visit, Mr. Wiltshire had interested a number of people in the doctrines of the New Church. Following his visit, however, the "Ebenezer New-Church Mission" was organized, under the leadership of Mr. Henry Algernon, with eighteen members. At that time conditions in Dutch Guiana were most difficult. As an example, the attendance at Sunday school was seriously reduced because it was necessary for the children to stay at home on Sunday so that their clothes might be washed and ready for school on Monday. The total collection for the year 1925 was $1.42. The following year the collection increased with an increase in membership; but there was still a deficit of $57.00, which Mr. Algernon had to take care of in addition to supporting a family of six on his annual salary of $300.00.

The amount which Mr. Algernon has been able to accomplish in spite of these handicaps is remarkable. In 1926-27 sixty-two services and sixty-nine reading circle meetings were held. To quote from his report:

> Many of our most earnest members work for many months of the year in the balata forests. They are what is commonly called balata bleeders. I have given them tracts, leaflets, sermons, and copies of "Heaven and Hell" and the "Four Doctrines." I have had a request for Giles's "The True and the False Theory of Evolution"; and I need more doctrinal books and good English Bibles, for the latter cannot be purchased here. I could also make good use of old copies of the Book of Worship, Hosanna, and Magnificat. I am trying to make the most of every opportunity to spread the truth; and the circle of knowledge is widening. I would like, if possible, to secure a copy of Swedenborg's "Economy of the Animal Kingdom" for my barber; and this book could also be used to advantage with others.

It is good to know that the Board of Missions has since

purchased and forwarded to him Bibles, Books of Worship and Hosannas.

Japan.—Turning now to the Orient, we find the one field of missionary endeavor with which New-Church people in America are probably most familiar. I refer to the work in Japan. Because this work is relatively so well known, I shall touch only on the most important aspects of Mr. Watanabe's activity.

Mr. Watanabe graduated from the Theological School in 1918, and soon thereafter returned to Japan, taking up residence in Tokyo. On March 30, 1919, the first New-Church service was held in Japan, with seven people in attendance. This group had increased to forty in the following year; and forty-eight new members were received in 1921. Since that time the Church has grown steadily, if not as rapidly as during the first few years.

As a line of activity likely to prove fruitful in religious converts, Mr. Watanabe early recognized the importance of educational institutions under proper supervision, particularly as the public schools were inadequate. He dreamed of the day when a New-Church school would be established; and, as you all know, this dream has since become a reality.

It is interesting to know that we find the modern tendencies just as evident in Japan as anywhere else. For example, in speaking of the Sunday school Mr. Watanabe says: "The children do not want to hear truth only, but they wish to be amused too; and therefore we have pictures and field days with games and entertainments."

Mr. Watanabe's work has not been limited to Tokyo and vicinity, for he has made many missionary trips to other parts of Japan. One trip of ten days' duration added seventeen members to the New Church; while a three weeks' trip to Western Japan brought fifty-two believers. In the year 1925, one hundred and six people accepted the doctrines of the New Church; and this great work was done notwithstanding difficulties due to the obsolete style of all available books.

In 1926 the Tokyo Society of the New Church was meeting under the leadership of Rev. Yonezo Doi; and the following year this Society was formally organized. This made it possible for Mr. Watanabe to devote the major part of his time to promoting the New-Church College of Music, work on the first unit of which, costing $8,000, had been authorized by the Board of Missions on September 30, 1925. The College started auspiciously with one hundred and ninety-two enrolled students, thirty professors, and a staff of seven. Land valued at $90,000 had been donated to the College; funds for two dormitories were raised; and as the plans developed, the Board of Missions raised $25,000 for the principal school building. The College is therefore apparently well launched; and Mr. Watanabe believes it will become an increasingly important factor in the growth and development of the New Church in Japan.

Philippine Islands.—One of the most unusual New-Church missionary developments is the interest in the Philippines. In 1917 Rev. Robert J. Strong stopped in Manila on his return to Auckland, N. Z., from America, and became acquainted with Mr. Idlefonso Agulo, an interested believer in the truths of the New Church, who had gathered about him almost one hundred other receivers. There followed correspondence between Mr. Agulo and the Board of Missions, culminating in the sending of Rev. George G. Pulsford to Manila in June, 1920. Mr. Pulsford spent some time in the Islands, serving at Mr. Agulo's ordination, helping to secure New-Church books, and starting plans for a New-Church house of worship.

Mr. Pulsford found two hundred and seventy-two accepted members of the New Church in the Island of Luzon, eleven who wished to join, and one hundred and ninety-seven others who had expressed interest. On the central islands, under Mr. Evangelista, about seventy were interested.

It is sometimes difficult for us to see the Divine Providence in events; and so it is with Mr. Agulo's death on March 28, 1923. He had done so much to give the truths

of the New Church to the people of the Philippines, and it seemed as if his work had only just begun! And then on June 9th of the same year, Mr. Pulsford was also called to the spiritual world, probably as a direct result of the intense work he had done in the Islands. It may be truly said of him that he laid down his life for his friends.

The loss of Mr. Pulsford and Mr. Agulo was a serious set-back to the work in the Philippines. However, Mr. Evangelista came to Cambridge for instruction at the Theological School; and other local leaders were found. Mr. Evangelista returned to the Islands after his study here, and in 1927 was appointed leader of the New Church in Manila. Since that time he has been doing conscientious work. He has made a good many lecture tours, but is handicapped by the shortage of books in the native dialect. However, a High School group in San José wishes to establish a New-Church society and library; and this will be the first English-speaking society in the Islands. The church building at Tondo has been completed, and has a congregation of from fifty to two hundred, although, as Mr. Evangelista puts it, they are still of "all shades of thought and belief."

One of the principal difficulties in the development of active work for the Church in the Philippines, is that, in accordance with the prevailing custom, no collections are taken, and expenses must be borne entirely by the Board of Missions and a few interested leaders. Nevertheless, progress is being made; and we should watch the situation with interest and optimism for the future.

Burma.—In point of distance from America, the recent interest in Swedenborg and the New Church in Burma is unique. I had to look up Burma on the map; and so perhaps you will be interested to learn, if you do not already know, that it is the most easterly of the states of India, being bounded on the east by China, and on the south by the Bay of Bengal, a part of the Indian Ocean. The principal cities are Rangoon and Mandelay, the latter being of course familiar through Kipling's famous poem.

We find the first mention of Mr. A. Boo's activity in Burma in the reports for 1922; and the following year we learn that he has started a lending library of Swedenborg's books in his home in Moulmein, about one hundred miles from Rangoon. However, his first direct report on his activity was in 1925, at which time he had been working something over two years for the Church, and was giving his full time to it. His work includes keeping a small lending library, preaching daily morning and evening, visiting friends, writing articles for the *Burman Messenger*, and making lecture tours. He has given New-Church literature to many leaders; and in Moulmein alone over forty are reading, and twenty-five have definitely accepted the truth of the doctrines.

The Rev. Eric A. Sutton of Glasgow visited Moulmein in 1925, and proved to be most helpful in assisting Mr. Boo. As a result of Mr. Sutton's visit, Rev. Nai Di, formerly a Baptist minister, accepted the New Church, and brought many of his congregation with him. Five of those most interested, including Mr. Boo, have since started correspondence courses with the Theological School. Mr. Boo says that he is closely in touch with many ministers in Burma, and that he finds the truth of the New Church is spreading. There is something of Divine inspiration in his outline of our Church and his mission as he understands it. He writes:

The Hand of the Lord is here in Burma, and He is forming man of the dust of ground, and breathing into his nostrils the breath of life, that man may become a living soul.

The Lord's New Church is the Crown Church of all the churches; and His mission is the mission for all the denominations of Christianity and other religions. He alone is doing the work, though we are used by Him outwardly.

Every New-Churchman should admit that we of ourselves can do nothing of good and truth. We move and have our being through Divine Providence. He came down to us from on high, and assumed the human nature to fight self and the world for us, to subjugate hell and keep heaven in order, for us. He associated with the fishermen and publicans to help them from their understandings, thus, to bring them up gradually into the light and life of Him.

It is the will of the Lord that every member of the Lord's New Church follow His foot-steps, and do as He has done for us; to associate as He associated with everyone, every denomination of the Christian Church, and other religions, to go down to their understandings, to help them and bring them up as He did, from the low states and understandings into the higher states, to the light and unto Him and His Church. A New-Churchman is His chisel by which He is forming the image of Himself in the soul of everyone.

Since the Rev. Nai Di has entered into active work for the New Church, he too has had much to tell of his experiences. He finds that preaching and the written word are the best way to spread the doctrines; and he has received many appreciative letters from people who have been helped by them. Apparently it is not easy to preach the New Christianity in Burma; for he writes that many of those who have associated with the New Church have had to go through severe trial and temptation. Mr. Di reports hearing a series of lectures by Dr. Stanley Jones, the author of "The Christ of the Indian Road." He writes: "They helped us very much, as we find every one of his lectures based on the teachings of the New Jerusalem." And later in the same letter we read:

Wherever we go and preach, we have the perception of the angelic society around us, helping us to proclaim the Second Advent of the Lord boldly, whether in church, or to individuals, or to our own Society.

I wish that space permitted me to write more about the work in Burma, for to me it is the most fascinating of our missionary fields; and there is so much more that would be interesting,—about such things as their Christmas tree for the Sunday school, to which Catholics, Mohammedans, and Buddhists were invited, or the way in which they are finding throughout Burma an acceptance of many New-Church truths, the source of which is often difficult to trace. However, it must suffice merely to leave with you the knowledge that the New Church in Burma is very much awake; and we can feel with Mr. Boo that the hand of the Lord is working there.

In any consideration of the missionary work of the New Church as a whole, there is one question which is perhaps more important than any other. It is this: "Which of the doctrines of the New Church seem to have the most appeal to these new believers who are accepting them so gladly?". And I am led to believe from the reading I have been able to do during recent months, that it is the simple fundamental truths that are most eagerly accepted, and that mean most. This is particularly evident in the Philippines and Burma. They have received with joy and sincerity the truths that Jesus is the only God of heaven and earth, and that they are saved who believe in Him and keep His Commandments. This is perhaps indicative of those who are most ready to accept New-Church truth,—those of simple faith and in love to the Lord and the neighbor.

The future of the New Church in the Foreign Field, however, is not secure. It will require our continuing interest and support, both financial and otherwise. Very few of the societies or associations can yet be called fully self-supporting, although self-support will, no doubt, come later; and the Board of Missions is encouraging initiative and self-reliance at every possible opportunity.

Furthermore, a faith that the Lord will bring the truths of the New Christianity to man is not enough. We must believe that He can work best *through* men. Until, therefore, we do our utmost to bring the truth to those who are seeking it, we are like the candle hid under a bushel. Do we not need something more of the spirit of the early apostles, to save us from the danger of becoming too self-satisfied, and content with the joy and peace which these truths have brought to us? Just as long as we know there is a need and a desire in the world for truth which we can give, with which we have been entrusted, we have failed in our full duty if we do not accept gladly this great responsibility that is ours, and put forth our very best efforts to bring to those who are in darkness the light of the New Christianity.

PHILIP M. ALDEN.

EMERSON AND THE DOCTRINE OF CORRESPONDENCE. II.

By Clarence Paul Hotson[1]

IN the first part of this essay (in the January issue of this Review) I traced the influence of Swedenborg's doctrine of correspondence upon the mind of Ralph Waldo Emerson up to the time when he wrote his lecture in "Representative Men" on "Swedenborg; or, the Mystic." I quoted directly or indirectly seventy references to or statements of this doctrine in his "Journals" and published works from 1826, when he first read Sampson Reed's "Growth of the Mind," to 1849, when he finished the "Mystic" lecture.

In the second part I had intended to discuss his references to and use of this doctrine in the lecture itself. Since, however, the order of climax is more important than the strict order of chronology, I have decided to leave that subject until the third and final part of my essay, and in this second part to indicate the extent and significance of Emerson's use of this idea in the closing years of his literary career.

Several years passed after the publication of "Swedenborg; or, the Mystic," before Emerson again referred to the doctrine of correspondence in his "Journal." Between September 8 and November 16, 1853, or four years later, he wrote, as already noted, that Swedenborg existed to say that inner and outer correspond (J. VIII, 422).

In his "Journal," in August, 1854, apparently with Swedenborg in mind (whom he mentioned on the preceding

[1] The author acknowledges the courtesy of the Houghton, Mifflin Company in permitting the use of certain copyrighted matter contained in Emerson's "Journals" (10 vols.) and in the Centenary Edition of his works (12 vols.).

page), Emerson said that amid myriads of invalids, fops, dunces, and all kinds of damaged individuals, one sound healthy brain will be turned out, in symmetry and in relation to the system of the world,—eyes that can see, ears that can hear, soul that can feel, mind that can receive the resultant truth:

> This person sees the simple and vast conditions which every law of Nature must fulfil, and is prepared to admit the circulation of the blood, the genesis of the planets, universal gravity, the analogy running through all parts of nature, and the correspondence of physics and metaphysics. (J. VIII, 478-479.)

The idea of "Affections Clothed," of which Emerson made so much use before 1849, as I showed by nine citations in my first paper, continued to play its part in his thought. In the "Journal," August, 1855, he wrote that there is never a fine aspiration but is on its way to its body or institution (J. VIII, 543). And in the "Journal," 1858:

> Great men are they that see spiritual is greater than any material force, and that thoughts rule the world.[2] But a thought which does not go to embody or externize itself, is no thought. (J. IX, 175.)
>
> Every thought rushes to light—rushes to body.[3] (J. IX, 176.)

In "The Sovereignty of Ethics," first printed 1878, this idea again appears:

> Every wish, appetite and passion rushes into act and embodies itself in usages, protects itself with laws. (Centenary, X, 190.)

Similarly in "Perpetual Forces," 1862, Emerson said:

> The world stands on ideas. . . . Nations of men and their institutions rest on thoughts. (Centenary, X, 88.)

And in "Powers and Laws of Thought"[4] Emerson said:

---

[2] Emerson used this sentence in "Progress of Culture," 1867, (Centenary, VIII, 229) shortly after he mentioned Swedenborg.

[3] Compare "Powers and Laws of Thought," 1860. (Centenary, XII, 41.)

[4] Part of a course of lectures entitled "Natural History of Intellect," given at Cambridge in 1870 and 1871, but composed of matter which had been used in other lectures, some of it as early as 1848.

I believe the mind is the creator of the world, and is ever creating;—that at last Matter is dead Mind; that mind makes the senses it sees with; that the genius of man is a continuation of the power that made him, and that has not done making him. (Centenary, XII, 17.)

In "Instinct and Inspiration," in the same series of lectures, Emerson said:

In the healthy mind, the thought is not a barren thesis, but expands, varies, recruits itself with relations to all Nature, paints itself in wonderful symbols, appears in new men, in institutions, in social arrangements, in wood, in stone, in art, in books. (Centenary, XII, 70-71.)

This adaptation of the "Affections Clothed" idea matches another in the same lecture:

Whence came all these tools, inventions, books, laws, parties, kingdoms? Out of the invisible world, through a few brains. (*Ibid.*, 80.)

Still more definite is the statement in "Powers and Laws of Thought," that the perceptions of the soul pass into other minds, and ripened and unfolded by many they hasten to incarnate themselves in action, to take body, only to carry forward the will which sent them out:

They take to themselves wood and stone and iron; ships and cities and nations and armies of men and ages of duration; the pomps of religion, the armaments of war, the codes and heraldry of states; agriculture, trade, commerce. . . . (*Ibid.*, 18.)

And finally, in "The Scholar," an oration he delivered June 28, 1876, Emerson said:

Men know that ideas are the parents of men and things; there was never anything that did not proceed from a thought. (Centenary, X, 271-272.)

In all, then, it appears that there are nineteen passages in Emerson's "Journals" and published works more or less clearly traceable to "the Swedenborgian idea of Affections Clothed."

Between September 5 and October 11, 1854, Emerson remarked in his "Journal" that one class of minds delights

in a bounded fact, and the other class in its relations or correspondency to all other facts. (J. VIII, 501.) February 18, 1855, he wrote that to see the world representatively implies high gifts. (J. VIII, 517.) Between February 11 and February 24, 1855, he remarked:

> As long as you deal with sensible objects in the sphere of sense, call things by their right names. But every man may be, and some men are, raised to a platform whence he sees beyond sense to moral and spiritual truth; when he no longer sees snow as snow, or horses as horses, but only sees or names them representatively for those interior facts which they signify. This is way the poets use them. . . . The success with which this is done can alone determine how genuine is the inspiration. (J. VIII, 520-521.)

Emerson associated his thought of the doctrine of correspondence so closely with his theory of poetry that I can hardly treat them separately. I reserve, however, a number of passages which I might well include in this paper, for treatment in a paper on "Swedenborg as Emerson's Poet."

July 28, 1857, Emerson wrote that, if natural philosophy is faithfully written, moral philosophy need not be, for it will find itself expressed in these theses to a perceptive soul (J. IX, 107). In September of the same year he wrote:

> Imagination is the nomination of the causal facts, the laws of the soul, by the physical facts. All physical facts are words for spiritual facts, and Imagination, by naming them, is the Interpreter, showing us the unity of the world. (J. IX, 127.)

In September, 1857, he remarked that it is only moral and rational man that Nature subserves; and further:

> Whatever we study in Nature, 'tis always found to be the study of man. . . . If you could once show an independency and foreignness in Nature, we should never care for it more. (J. IX, 132.)

In "Country Life," a lecture Emerson gave in Boston, March, 1858, he said:

> The gulf between our seeing and our doing is a symbol of that between faith and experience. (Centenary, XII, 157.)

In the same lecture Emerson said:

> Nature speaks to the imagination . . . because her visible produc-

tions and changes are the nouns of language, and our only means of uttering the invisible thought. (163-164.)

He mentioned Swedenborg in this connection:

Nature is only a mirror in which man is reflected colossally. Swedenborg or Behmen or Plato tried to decipher this hieroglyphic, and explain what rock, what sand, what wood, what fire signified in regard to man.

They may have been right or wrong in any particulars of their interpretation, but it is only our ineradicable belief that the world answers to man, and part to part, that gives any interest in the subject. If we believed that Nature was foreign and unrelated, . . . we should think all exploration of it a frivolous waste of time. (Centenary, XII, 165.)

In "Concord Walks," a lecture he gave probably in 1867 at the Concord Lyceum, Emerson said similarly:

The man finds himself expressed in Nature. Yet when he sees this annual reappearance of beautiful forms, . . . he may well ask himself the special meaning of the hieroglyphic, as well as the sense and scope of the whole. (*Ibid.*, 179.)

Between February 14 and March, 1859, Emerson referred in his "Journal" (J. IX, 175) to the correspondence of the mind to the world. This idea he developed in "Success" (Society and Solitude), written in 1859:

The fundamental fact in our metaphysic constitution is the correspondence of man to the world, so that every change in that writes a record in the mind. The mind yields sympathetically to the tendencies or law which stream through things and make the order of Nature; and in the perfection of this correspondence or expressiveness, the health and force of man consist. (Centenary, VII, 300-301.)

August, 1858, Emerson wrote in his poem "The Adirondacks":

> Judge with what sweet surprises Nature spoke
> To each apart, lifting her lovely shows
> To spiritual lessons pointed home,
> And as through dreams in watches of the night,
> So through all creatures in their forms and ways
> Some mystic hint accosts the vigilant,

Not clearly voiced, but waking a new sense
Inviting to new knowledge, one with old.
(Centenary, IX, 189-190.)

And, that no day of life may lack romance,
The spiritual stars rise nightly, shedding down
A private beam into each several heart.
Daily the bending skies solicit man. (*Ibid.*, 190.)

In "The Miracle" (between 1858 and 1865), Emerson sang:

Nature, the supplement of man,
His hidden sense interpret can.
(Centenary, IX, 368.)

In his "Journal," between February 14 and March, 1859, he wrote that analogy is the key of the universe (J. IX, 176); between February 16 and April, 1860, that Nature is a mere mirror, and shows to each man only his own quality (*ibid.*, 264). Between May and September 11, 1860, he wrote:

Pairs: I am a matchmaker, and delight in nothing more than in finding the husband or mate of the trivial fact I have long carried in my memory (unable to offer any reason for the emphasis I gave it), until now, suddenly, it shows itself as the true symbol or expression of some abstraction. (J. IX, 272-273.)

This note throws light on the meaning of the following couplet from "The Poet" (a poem he began in 1838 but finished much later):

Through worlds and races and terms and times
Saw musical order and pairing rhymes.
(Centenary, IX, 311.)

In "Wealth" (Conduct of Life, 1860) Emerson wrote:

The same correspondence that is between thirst in the stomach and water in the spring, exists between the whole of man and the whole of nature. (Centenary, VI, 89.)

In "Worship" (1860), Emerson spoke of the continuation of the inflexible law of matter into the subtile kingdom of will and thought. (Centenary, VI, 219.)

In "Michael Angelo," a lecture he gave in 1835 (published first in June, 1837), Emerson had already a reference to the symbolism of the human body, of which Swedenborg made so much:

> Reflection discloses evermore a closer analogy between the finite form and the infinite inhabitant. Man is the highest, and indeed the only proper object of plastic art. There needs no better proof of our instinctive feeling of the immense expression of which the human figure is capable than the uniform tendency which the religion of every country has betrayed towards Anthropomorphism, or attributing to the Deity the human form. (Centenary, XII, 221-222.)

In "Wealth," 1860, therefore, we are not surprised to find a passage still more suggestive of Swedenborg's teaching:

> It is a doctrine of philosophy that man is a being of degrees; that there is nothing in the world which is not repeated in his body, his body being a sort of miniature or summary of the world; then, there is nothing in his brain which is not repeated in a higher sphere in his moral system. (Centenary, VI, 124-125.)

In "Perpetual Forces" (1862) Emerson said:

> The brain of man has methods and arrangements corresponding to these material powers, by which he can use them. (Centenary, X, 73.)

In "Beauty" (1860), Emerson again stated the doctrine of correspondence:

> All the facts in nature are nouns of the intellect, and make the grammar of the eternal language. Every word has a double, treble or centuple use and meaning. . . . And there is a joy in perceiving the representative or symbolic character of a fact, which no bare fact or event can ever give. (Centenary, VI, 304.)

In "Old Age" (Society and Solitude), which he wrote in 1861, I find:

> He (the youth) is tormented with the want of correspondence between things and thoughts. (Centenary, VII, 326.)

Similarly in "The Scholar," an oration delivered June 28, 1876, Emerson said:

The young . . . finding that nothing outside corresponds to the noble order in the soul, are confused, and become skeptical and forlorn. (Centenary, X, 279.)

In "Life and Letters in New England," which he wrote around 1867, Emerson said:

The value of Fourier's system is that it is a statement of such an (ideal) order externized, or carried outward into its correspondence in facts. (*Ibid.*, 352.)

This may explain his earlier statement in the same paper, that in Fourier's system mechanics were pushed so far as fairly to meet "spiritualism":

One could not but be struck with strange coincidences betwixt Fourier and Swedenborg. (*Ibid.*, 349.)

Both these passages originally appeared in a paper Emerson wrote for the *Dial* for July, 1842.

In "The Celebration of Intellect," an address he delivered at Tufts College, July 10, 1861, Emerson said:

Now the idea of a college is an assembly of such men, obedient each to this pure light, and drawing from it illumination to that science or art to which his constitution and affections draw him. And the very highest advantage which a young man of good mind can meet is to find such a teacher. . . . Here is sympathy; here is an order that corresponds to that in his own mind. . . . And education is what it should be, a delightful unfolding of the faculties in right order. (Centenary, XII, 123-124.)

In "Perpetual Forces" (1862) Emerson said:

Intellect and morals appear only the material forces on a higher plane. The laws of material nature run up into the invisible world of the mind. (Centenary, X, 72.)

Similarly in "The Sovereignty of Ethics" (1878), a compilation by James Elliot Cabot from various lectures of Emerson's, we read:

The intellectual and moral worlds are analogous to the material. (Centenary, X, 183.)

In the same lecture he says that man does not see that he only is real, and the world his mirror and echo:

The student discovers one day that . . . all he calls Nature, all that he calls institutions, when once his mind is active are visions merely, wonderful allegories, significant pictures of the laws of the mind; and through this enchanted gallery he is led by unseen guides to read and learn the laws of Heaven. (*Ibid.*, 191-192.)

In "The Preacher," composed of matter used in 1867 lectures, Emerson said:

Nature is too thin a screen; the glory of the One breaks in everywhere. (*Ibid.*, 223.)

In "Boston," a lecture he gave in Boston in the spring of 1861, Emerson said:

As true philosophers, we must believe that chemical atoms also have their spiritual cause . . . ; that carbon, oxygen, alum and iron each has its origin in spiritual nature. (Centenary, XII, 184.)

June 6, 1862, Emerson noted the correspondence, or balance, everywhere (J. IX, 422). In March or April, 1863, he wrote:

On the lower plane, it is called Heat; on the higher, Love. Whenever you enunciate a physical law, I hear in it a moral rule. (J. IX, 490.)

In "Education" (1864, published 1884) Emerson said that man's great danger is to overlook the fact that the world is only his teacher (Centenary, X, 127). In some sort the end of life is that the man should take up the universe into himself (*ibid.*, 131). The truth takes flesh in forms that can express it. The world exists for the mind. We learn nothing rightly until we learn the symbolical character of life (*ibid.*, 132).

October 25, 1866, Emerson wrote:

I don't know but I value the name of a thing, that is, the true poet's name for it, more than the thing. If I can get the right word for the moon, or about it,—the word that suggests to me and to all men its humane and universal beauty and significance,—then I have what I want of it. (J. X, 175-176.)

In March, 1867, Emerson said that the word "miracle," as used, only indicates the savage ignorance of the devotee. The great miracle is that

Here he stands, a lonely thought, harmoniously organized into correspondence with the universe of Mind and Matter. (J. X, 198.)

This sentence he used in "The Sovereignty of Ethics" (Centenary, X, 200, first published 1878).

Between July 2 and July 18, 1867, speaking of the sublime delight with which the intellect contemplates each new analogy between the laws of nature and its own laws of life, Emerson said:

I cannot yet say accurately what is the analogon of each cosmical or chemical law; Swedenborg, or a possible Swedenborg, can; but I affirm with perfect security that such analogon for each material law observed exists in the spiritual nature. (J. X, 206.)

In "The Progress of Culture," a Phi Beta Kappa address he read at Cambridge, July 18, 1867, Emerson said:

Every law in Nature, as gravity, centripetence, repulsion, polarity, undulation, has a counterpart in the intellect. The laws above are sisters of the laws below. . . . Nature is a fable whose moral blazes through it. (Centenary, VIII, 222-223.)

In "Poetry and Imagination" (1875) Emerson wrote:

Swedenborg saw gravity to be only an external of the irresistible attractions of affection and faith. (Centenary, VIII, 16.)

Earlier in "The Progress of Culture" Emerson said that to centrality or gravity Truth answers in the intellectual world (Centenary, VIII, 221). And in the same lecture:

Mind carries the law; history is the slow and atomic unfolding. All things admit of this extended sense, and the universe at last is only prophetic, or, shall we say, symptomatic, of vaster interpretation and results. (*Ibid.*, 223.)

On the next page he says that the good wit finds the law from a single observation,—the law, and its limitations, and its correspondences.

In his "Journal," late in 1873, Emerson wrote what is perhaps his latest note on the subject:

All the new facts of science are not only interesting for themselves, but their best value is the rare effect on the mind, the electric shock; each new law of Nature speaks to a related fact in our thought: for every law of Chemistry has some analogon in

the soul, and however skilful the chemist may be, and how much soever he may push and multiply his researches, he is a superficial trifler in the presence of the student who sees the strict analogy of the experiment to the laws of thought and of morals. (J. X, 422.)

The following lines from "Una," published in 1867, are suggestive of correspondence:

> At home a deeper thought may light
> The inward sky with chrysolite.
> (Centenary, IX, 211.)

September 1, 1867, Emerson wrote that he wished to find in his preacher that power to illuminate and warm and purify, which he knew in the fiery souls which had cheered and lifted his life, and, if possible,

> That power to clothe every secret and abstract thought in its corresponding material symbol. Seas and mountains, timber and metals, diamonds and fossils, interest the eye, but it is only with some preparatory or predicting charm; their real value comes only when I hear their meaning made plain in the spiritual truth they cover. (J. X, 214.)

This he repeated in "Poetry" (Centenary, VIII, 11).

In the "Journal," 1862-1872, Emerson wrote that Nature is always the effect, Mind the flowing cause (J. X, 459); between March 18 and May 22, 1868, that the Mind must think by means of Matter; that it must find Matter or Nature the means and words of its thinking or expression. The world (is) its school and university for Thought (J. X, 236).

In "Natural History of Intellect," 1870 and 1871, Emerson showed that the idea of correspondence still had all its hold upon his mind:

> Every object in Nature is a word to signify some fact in the mind. (Centenary, XII, 5.)

Here he did not say, as he had in "The Mystic," that every object in Nature is a word to signify every fact in the mind.

A muskrat is only man modified to live in a mud-bank.

There is a perfect correspondence (*ibid.*, 22). Everywhere in Nature we are surprised with occult sympathies:

> From whatever side we look at Nature we seem to be exploring the figure of a disguised man. How obvious is the momentum, in our mental history! The momentum, which increases by exact laws in falling bodies, increases by the same rate in the intellectual action. (*Ibid.*, 23.)

Mental and moral diseases are contagious, as well as physical (*ibid.*, 23-24). Plants and their growth reflect similar processes in the mind (*ibid.*, 24-26). In the subsequent pages Emerson gave many other illustrations.

> The measure of mental health is the disposition to find good everywhere, good and order, analogy, health and benefit. (*Ibid.*, 62.)

In "Inspiration," a lecture which he delivered before the Peabody Institute in Baltimore, in January, 1872, Emerson said:

> Words used in a new sense and figuratively, dart a delightful lustre; and every word admits a new use, and hints ulterior meanings. (Centenary, VIII, 294.)

Emerson asks where the Franklin is who can inspire men, and make the world transparent, so that they can read the symbols of Nature (*ibid.*, 274). On the following page he mentions Swedenborg as a man of enthusiasm, one who must solve the problems that haunt him, though he be crazed or killed (*ibid.*, 275). Swedenborg's genius was the perception of the doctrine that "The Lord flows into the spirits of angels and of men" (*ibid.*, 277).

"Poetry and Imagination" (compiled with the help of Mr. James Elliot Cabot in 1875, but largely put together from material written at various times, some of it much earlier), contains the following references to correspondence:

> Perfect parallelism between the laws of Nature and the laws of thought exist. (Centenary, VIII, 8.)

While the student, says Emerson, ponders this immense unity, he observes that

> All things in Nature . . . have a mysterious relation to his thoughts and his life; their growths, decays, quality and use so curiously resemble himself, in parts and in wholes, that he is compelled to speak by means of them. His words and his thoughts are framed by their help. Every noun is an image. Nature gives him, sometimes in a flattered likeness, sometimes in caricature, a copy of every humor and shade in his character and mind. The world is an immense picture-book of every passage in human life. Every object he beholds is the mask of a man. (*Ibid.*, 9.)

Every correspondence we observe in mind and matter suggests a substance older and deeper than either of these old nobilities (*ibid.*, 9).

> The primary use of a fact is low; the secondary use, as it is a figure or illustration of my thought, is the real worth. (*Ibid.*, 11.)

In the following passage Emerson used as a verb the word "ultimate," like a disciple of Swedenborg:

> A deep insight will always, like Nature, ultimate its thought in a thing. As soon as a man masters a principle and sees his facts in relation to it, fields, waters, skies, offer to clothe his thoughts in images. . . . He can now find symbols of universal significance, which are readily rendered into any dialect. (*Ibid.*, 17-18.)

Imagination is a perception and affirming of a real relation between a thought and some material fact (*ibid.*, 29). Homer, Milton, Hafiz, Herbert, Swedenborg, Wordsworth, are heartily enamoured of their sweet thoughts:

> Moreover, they know that this correspondence of things to thoughts is far deeper than they can penetrate,—defying adequate expression; that it is elemental, or in the core of things. (*Ibid.*, 29.)

Nature is only a language to express the laws, which are grand and beautiful. The great teachers and Bibles of the nations all deal with Nature and history as means and symbols, and not as ends. (*Ibid.*, 38.)

> In good society, nay, among the angels in heaven, is not everything spoken in fine parable, and not so servilely as it befell to the sense? All is symbolized. (*Ibid.*, 71.)

Finally, in "Immortality" (1875) Emerson said:

> These long-lived or long-enduring objects are to us as we see them, only symbols of somewhat in us far longer-lived. (Centenary, VIII, 336.)

Thus I find that in his published works and in his "Journal" Emerson referred to or used the doctrine of correspondence some eighty-three times, from the publication of "Swedenborg" until the end of his literary career. This fact shows that he owed to Swedenborg one of his principal ideas, which influenced his life continuously and profoundly throughout his entire career.

In the third and final part of this article I shall discuss Emerson's treatment of this doctrine, and of Swedenborg in connection with it, in "Swedenborg; or, the Mystic."

Clarence Paul Hotson.

Drury College.

(To be continued)

"THE NEW EVOLUTION"

By George Henry Dole

THE recent paper by Dr. Austin H. Clark of the United States National Museum, published in the *Quarterly Review of Biology,* Vol. 3, No. 4, has been noticed in the press as the "New Evolution." Dr. Clark is too well informed so to call it. He entitled his treatise "Animal Evolution." Though his general theory is not new, nevertheless it contains matter that is new, and presents principles with clarity of thought and soundness of doctrine that, according to our way of thinking, surpass anything heretofore appearing in generally current science.

The points of supreme interest in Dr. Clark's argument are: (a) the tenets that the groups of animal life called species are separated by gaps too wide to be crossed by evolution, in the sense of the transmutation of species; (b) that the normal type of a species contains potentialities from which come the variants; and (c) the new explanation of how all forms from the crystal up fit into a unifying order or general system. This last point is illustrated by a diagram. It is regretted that the discussion is too technical to be literally presented here. It can be followed only by those who have had some special training in biology; yet it is so luminous and fertile of suggestion that the general reader will profit much by reading the paper itself. We shall try to state in simple language the main themes of the paper, and make understandable the general suggestions and underlying principles.

Preparatory for the statement of Dr. Clark's conclusions, it may be helpful first to consider what our Church teaches concerning the subject; for Dr. Clark's theory, as far as it goes, seems, on its scientific plane, to be in full harmony

with the doctrines of the New Church concerning the processes of creation.

Divine Love and Divine Wisdom in the Lord are not two things, but one. They proceed from Him as one, and are in a certain image in every created thing (Divine Providence, n. 5). Through influx of the Lord's love and wisdom into nature, the atmosphere and essences of the earth are actuated into forms within and without (Divine Love and Wisdom, nn. 311, 312). As certainly as this is true, there must be some oneness, likeness, or similarity in every created thing, from the crystal to the most complex of living forms.

Further, spiritual heat and light, which are the creative energy proceeding from the Lord, contain all the infinities that are in the Lord (True Christian Religion, n. 365). They carry with them the image of the Lord, and clothe it in corresponding forms according to fixed laws (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 315). This is a general law operating on the planes of minerals, plants, and animals (Divine Wisdom, post., XI, 4). This principle necessitates a similarity continually ascending from the lowest to the highest created form. It is the perception and illustration of this illuminating and inevitable law as it works on the planes of nature, that are distinctly new in science, and that are the heart of Dr. Clark's pronouncement.

The method by which Dr. Clark traces the universal similarity appeals to us as fundamentally and scientifically sound; and his reasonings go in the direction of genuine scientific advance. As far as they go, they appear to be in accord with spiritual truths and facts. To present particulars it may be helpful again to recall the teachings of our Church.

From the inflowing creative power, everything, even the smallest particle of dust, is charged with energy, and is in the endeavor to create, to reproduce its own self, and even something higher than itself; and this is done as fully as the specific form and the conditions will allow. The mineral is

in the endeavor to vegetate (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 62). The spiritual clothes itself with what is natural, as a man clothes himself with a garment (Intercourse of Soul and Body, n. 11). The operation of this creative endeavor is manifested on the mineral plane in the various forms of crystallization. A step higher it appears in the florescence in minerals, and in the plant-like forms of the frost on windows.

Dr. Clark rightly starts, it seems, with the principle of crystallization, making the statement that all organic forms fall under one of the several forms of crystallization. Of this his diagram is illustrative. If crystallization is a manifestation of the creative force operating in minerals, it is inevitable that there be a likeness of this action carried up onto the plane of vegetation; or, conversely, that the operation upon the vegetable plane has its likeness in the lower plane (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 5201). (Through this similitude there is "approach" and "presence" of the higher in the lower.) Crystallization has infinite forms of manifestation. Snowflakes are forms of crystallization. It is said that there are no two flakes exactly alike. Personally examining many, we have never found two exactly alike, though all examined had a common pattern of a center and six points of radiation. A section of a blade of grass under the microscope presents the likeness of the florescence of the frost on windows. From crystallization in minerals approaching florescence, the endeavor of minerals to vegetate is most obvious. In a like manner vegetation is in the endeavor to bring forth forms higher than itself, even the lower forms of animals that are in correspondence with its odoriferous exhalations (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 62). From the understanding of this principle come many perceptions of the action and effects of the force of crystallization in single-cell forms, in the cells of vegetation, and in the cells of highly organized beings. At this point and in this connection the fact that the action of the creative energy has no breaks may appear in satisfying light; and if

there are no breaks in the operation of the creative energy, the cause of the impassable, great gaps between species is seen to be in the difference between the infinities in the least things, for only a very few of the infinities can possibly appear upon the earth. When an infinity becomes finited in a created form, there is inevitably a vast gulf between it and any other embodied infinity.

The creative energy—which in the highest is the Creator Himself—exists interiorly in the least atom and in the simplest cell precisely as it is within the most complex organization. In other words, this is to say that the least and most lifeless particle of matter, the cell, and the most highly organized form extant, ascend by interior connection to the Creator Himself alike and without a break. Otherwise creation would vanish into nothing. The cell itself is composed of inorganic matter, particles that could not be held together an instant without unbroken connection with the Creator; for existence is perpetual creation. So in this consideration should be associated the idea of an unbroken ascent of the creative force not only from particles of inert matter, but also of a like ascent from the component, inert particles that compose a living cell. Thus the Creator is as fully present in the least particle of matter as He is in the most complex (Apocalypse Explained, n. 1199). This is the basic truth from which a certain similitude ranges the ascending scale of creation.

Now we come to the consideration of Dr. Clark's doctrine of evolution. In fact his theory is in no way evolution in the sense of the derivation of species. It is a square and direct refutation of linear evolution.

The desire has frequently been expressed that accredited scientists disprove the doctrine of the transmutation of species. It has been expressed from the time of Agassiz to the present day. But evolutionists have been so prolific in web-spinning, in dogmatic assertion, and in propaganda, that genuine science has been submerged. Impossible things have been so repeated that many have accepted them as true;

while the genuine scientist has modestly asserted the truth, and has trusted in truth itself rather than in repeated assertions. Here, in Dr. Clark's publication, is a sincere, scientific, and sufficient refutation of evolution as popularly understood, based upon profound study, acute analysis, and actual facts. His general theory is not new; yet it is new in the comprehensive statement of a general natural law, and in the clarity of explaining the distinctiveness of species.

Briefly summarized, Dr. Clark maintains that the gulfs between species are so great that it is impossible to connect species by the doctrine of descent; and that there is nothing known that evinces a connecting link. He emphatically declares that cats never became dogs, nor dogs cats. And he announces this most convincing fact,—that as one descends in the scale of animal life, even to the lowest (cephalochordates, balanogssids, and like forms known only to the specialist in biology), the wider is the gap that separates them. The gaps go back to the earliest fossils, he declares.

Let us get the full purport of this. It is well known that the leading evolutionists have recently been convinced that the differences are so great in man and the ape that man could not have descended from the ape. In substitution for the old theory, the bifurcation theory is proposed, which holds that early in the evolution, the line of ascent branched, culminating in the ape in one branch and in man at the end of the other branch. But as no evidence of a connecting link in the later forms of animals has been found, the possibility of connecting links in the larger gaps of the lower forms of life is too remote for rational consideration.

Our readers are familiar with the doctrine that material forms are created by spiritual initiaments infilling their lower parts from the essences of the earth and of plants; that in the spiritual initiament are unnumbered potencies ascending from the lowest to the highest; and that the nature of the thing created depends upon the height or degree that the spiritual initiament is infilled from nature. Though each created form is in the endeavor to produce something higher

than itself (as illustrated by minerals crystallizing and even producing the shell-like clay-stone concretions, and the like), no form can bring forth anything that transcends the degree in which the spiritual initiament is infilled with matter. In other words, each created form has potentialities tending upward and to variance. Dr. Clark takes exception to the old definition of species as inadequate, and gives a new one. His definition is so complete and rightly comprehensive, that it is given here:

> A species must be considered as represented by the so-called normal type plus all its variants and aberrations, whether occurring normally or induced by changed conditions.

Then follows the statement with which students of Swedenborg are most familiar; namely (in Dr. Clark's language):

> The variants and aberrations represent the potentialities, and with changed conditions any one or more of them may become an actuality.

The above constitutes a brief summary of Dr. Clark's contention in this regard, which, it seems, he has proved as fully as proof lies in such matters, and which, we believe, accords with and is supported by reason and all relevant facts; namely, that each species had an individual beginning; that variants in a species are due to indwelling potentialities; and that one species never crosses the great gap between species to another, but is limited by its innate potentialities.

Dr. Clark, in this respect, is in harmony with many noted biologists, among whom are Dr. W. H. Thompson, Professors Agassiz, Fleishman, Virchow, and Beal, and Dr. Etheridge, the famous fossilologist of the British Museum, who said: "In all this great museum there is not a particle of evidence of the transmutation of species."

Any theory of creation worthy of attention must offer explanation in harmony with facts and the present-day operation of creative laws. It is impossible rationally to conceive of an obsolete natural law. Natural laws always have

acted and always will act the same under like conditions. Conditions change, but natural laws are immutable.

In concluding this inadequate review of Dr. Clark's profound and admirable contribution to science, it may be due to say that it has been the purpose in these comments to cite its harmony with the doctrines of the New Church. In doing this, principles higher than science as generally defined will allow have been considered. The reader may clearly distinguish Dr. Clark's fundamental science from the superstructure.

George Henry Dole.

"SCIENCE IN SEARCH OF GOD"

By the Rev. Louis A. Dole

IS science in search of God? This question is brought forcibly to mind by the reading of Kirtley F. Mather's "Science in Search of God." Mr. Mather, who is a professor of geology at Harvard University, was one of the witnesses for the defense at the trial of John T. Scopes at Dayton, Tennessee, in the summer of 1925. In his preface he states that his experiences at that trial, together with his contacts with students and their religious problems, led him to attempt to formulate his views on the relation between science and religion. He remarks somewhat naïvely that the atmosphere of the student groups was different from that at the Scopes trial. The point of view which governs the book is clearly indicated in his statement that he has found many young people "awakening to a consciousness of the new light which the scientific habit of mind was throwing upon the foundations of religious beliefs" and indicating "their deep desire to cut away the husks of traditional doctrines to discover if possible the kernel of truth which may serve as a truly satisfactory basis for their philosophies of life." In other words, he starts with the familiar assumption that the "traditional religious beliefs" have been overthrown, and that the young people are looking to the only true authority when they turn to "science" for the solution of their "life problems,"—an assumption as baseless as its terms are vague. He says elsewhere:

> A Galileo is haled before the Sacred Congregation of the Index at Rome in 1633; a John Scopes is summoned into a District Court at Dayton, Tennessee, in 1925. Whatever may be the verdict of the particular time and place, the abiding judgment of thoughtful men everywhere is in favor of the scientist. With monotonous

regularity the world discovers that science is right, that theology is wrong.

This quotation, however, has a sequel; and thereby hangs a tale. Professor Mather continues:

> Does this set the precedent for the future? Must religion retreat ignominiously until it is pushed completely into the discard by an advancing and victorious science? The experience of the past does indeed suggest the trend of the future, but when the theologians have been thus defeated it was because they fought not as the champions of real religion but as the defenders of an outworn and faulty science in the face of a new and truer science. The cardinals at Rome in 1633, Mr. Bryan and his colleagues at Dayton in 1925, were not defending Christianity against its enemies; they were champions of the science which was current in about the year 1000 B.C. in the countries bordering on the eastern Mediterranean.

That is, in one compartment of his mind, Professor Mather reaches the conclusion that what science has overthrown is false science, and not theology; yet in another compartment, he bases upon the same instances the sweeping assertion that "with monotonous regularity the world discovers that science is right, that theology is wrong." Consistency would have dictated the statement in another form: "With monotonous regularity the world discovers that science has been wrong."

This same fundamental inconsistency runs through almost every page of the book, and a complete analysis would necessitate the quotation of dozens of consecutive statements like the above. He points out repeatedly that the fundamentals of religion are not in the external dress which it has been given from century to century; and yet throughout the book he treats the overthrow of these externals by science as a proof that science is remaking the fundamentals of religion. For example, he spends a whole chapter in platitudes concerning the achievements of science and the puerility of the "vest-pocket" concept of the world found in the Bible; then he convicts himself of having wasted his energy and our time by pointing out that "some of these documents are clearly allegorical, and were never intended

by their composers to be taken literally." For another contrast, consider the following two statements:

Those qualities of the spiritual which are revealed by measurable transformations of matter and of energy in time and space should be studied scientifically, just as the strength of gravity is determined by noting its effect upon the pendulum or the moon. By such study men of sciences may be led, "through Nature to Nature's God."

Eternal life, therefore, from the quantitative as well as the qualitative point of view, must be sought in the field of values rather than of materials, of the non-measurable rather than of the measurable, of religion rather than of science.

Still another contrast:

Whether we like it or not, the fundamentals of religion are today undergoing the most searching examination they have ever had, in the light of the most brilliant and pitiless blaze that modern science can project.

On the contrary, the result of much scientific discovery has been to affirm anew the validity of many of the truly fundamental doctrines of theology.

There are two main causes for the inconsistency of the book. One is the vague use of terms and the uncritical repetition of generalities, which is characteristic of much of the literature on the subject. The word "science" is used indiscriminately in several senses: as natural science, dealing with the physical phenomena of nature; as the concept of the material universe prevalent at one time or another in the past—Joshua's science, for example—which properly should not be called science at all; as the scientific method; as the philosophical reasonings of scientists; and as an hypostatized entity, a sort of gigantic personification of all the dicta of naturalistic scientists. This last sense of the word is so common, not only in Professor Mather's book but in current usage, that it demands further examination. We hear such expressions as "Science says," "We must look to science," "Science has proved that," etc. The individuals who make such statements do not, and often cannot, cite particular authorities. They use the word "science" as a

blanket term to cover anything and everything that they have read or heard of a naturalistic character, and often to cover inaccuracy and ignorance. In this way "Science" is made independent of the minds which brought it into being, is absolved of all error, and walks the earth, a mythical giant as truly worshipped today as were any of the pagan gods of old. Likewise, in Professor Mather's book, "religion" is used in several senses, varying from a general feeling of dependence upon God, through humanitarianism and a naturalistic philosophy as to the creative force pervading the universe, to a bogy which science is fighting. It is also sometimes identified with theology, although elsewhere the two are carefully distinguished. And theology is at one time defined as "the science of spiritual realities," and at others is scorned as a sort of metaphysical hair-splitting typical of the middle ages; while the theologian is almost consistently exhibited as in opposition to the scientist. The "fundamentals of religion" are mentioned again and again; but no clue is given as to what they are. The same is true of such expressions as "the doctrines of the Church," "traditional religion," and so on. The uncritical repetition of generalities is clearly illustrated by some of the statements already quoted: "The new light which the scientific habit of mind was throwing upon the foundations of religious beliefs"; the "desire to cut away the husks of traditional doctrines"; and "the judgment of thoughtful men everywhere is in favor of the scientist". Such statements mean nothing unless accompanied by illustration and proof; and the illustration and proof are as conspicuously lacking as is the "new light" cast by science upon the foundations of religion.

The second cause of the inconsistency of Professor Mather's book is psychological. He is obviously making an heroic effort to retain his own "traditional religious beliefs," and at the same time to uphold all the dogmas of present-day science. He even defends the anthropomorphic concept of God, the possibility of some of the miracles, and

the value of prayer. A hasty reading might lead one to say: "Here at last is a book by a scientist which points the way toward a reconciliation between science and religion". Unfortunately closer examination of the book discovers no rational ground for the reconciliation. Professor Mather's science and his religion are kept in separate compartments; and the grating which he inserts between them, while it may intrigue the imagination, scarcely affords a passage to the logical mind. He says:

> Even this early in the development of the science of psychology it is becoming evident that "the natural history of man is the whole history of man." No longer is there a wide chasm between the natural and the supernatural, between the material and the spiritual. In spite of the handicaps of our vocabulary and the limitations of our mental vision, we are being led inevitably into the ranks of the monists.

Here speaks the scientific compartment. But Professor Mather cannot stop here, for, as he says elsewhere,

> Granted that the man of science has to go outside of his own field and even trespass beyond the pale of natural science, he is somehow expected to have peculiar aptitude for making the venture out into the unknown where there is neither path for our guidance nor ground for our feet to tread.

So he finds himself under the necessity of getting over somehow into the religious compartment, and the following passage shows the device by which this is accomplished:

> We do well to make such distinctions as those implied by the contrast between matter and spirit, mind and soul; but those terms should not blind us to the fact that such contrasts are merely superficial or are imposed by the inadequacy of our own minds. They do not actually signify a fundamental cleavage of the universe into two interwoven "worlds." The dualistic philosophy which implied a conflict between rival administrators, God and Satan, or between spiritual ambitions and natural desires, was the product of the pre-scientific age. Just as we refer to the animal and vegetable kingdoms without contradicting the fact that all living organisms are manifestations of a vital energy which seems well-nigh limitless in its possibilities of varied expression, so we may retain the vocabulary of dualism and distinguish the material from the spir-

itual and still be true to monism with its concept of a universe in which the manifold realities of which we are now aware are still inadequate to express all the capabilities of creative energy. Man is not a creature from another plane or sphere, spending a small fraction of his existence in the strange environment of the earth, playing a brief role as an actor on a foreign stage before entering the environment for which he is truly fitted.

From this point on, he proceeds to "retain the vocabulary of dualism" to such good effect that he reaches the following conclusions:

There is "something back of the universe." Matter is neither eternal nor ultimate; it is a temporary and local expression of energy.

If man achieves immortality, it will be because he, although a creature of the earth who so far as his physical being is concerned is limited to the mundane environment, has nevertheless become sufficiently aware of the spiritual values in existence to incorporate them in his very being.

Nothing could be much more irreconcilable than Professor Mather's science and his religion. Speaking as a scientist, he says:

In a scientific age we know that everything happens in an orderly way in obedience to law; there is no outside interference whatsoever. Every effect is produced by an adequate cause discoverable within the universe; every cause is followed by its effect.

Yet as a "theologian" he can say that "there is something back of the universe." For naturalism, there is nothing back of the universe, for the reason that the universe is all there is. Again, speaking from the scientific point of view, Professor Mather, in dealing with the question of free-will, finds that environment and heredity determine man's actions, and says, "In the last analysis it is environment which has determined heredity." This obviously leaves no room for free-will; so, as he really believes in free-will, he feels compelled to add,

The laws by which the organic world is being governed are not yet understood. That there are such laws is an inescapable inference from all that we know about ourselves and the world in

which we live. The mystery about them does not invalidate the fact of their existence.

Later in the book, he makes still stronger statements from his religious intuitions:

> Explain it or not, the fact remains that man is something more than the mechanism perceptible to the five senses. . . . Doubtless aptitudes are determined for each individual by heredity and environment. But when we press the idea further, we are likely to get into danger. Any truth pushed to its ultimate extreme becomes dangerous and generally foolish.

Here his science comes to utter bankruptcy. Such a statement denies the very possibility of a rational explanation of the universe or of any part of it.

Certainly, if we are to judge by this book, we must answer our original question in the negative: science is not in search of God. Not a single statement which Professor Mather makes in regard to God follows logically upon any of his scientific statements or can be traced to his study of science. In his preface he says:

> It is of course impossible to make due acknowledgment to the many individuals who have contributed the ideas which have filtered through my mind upon the pages which follow. Impressions received, phrases heard or read, questions which stimulated thought, suggestions offered toward solutions of problems, all these and more are inextricably interwoven in the mind of any author. No one can realize more than I, my indebtedness to others for whatever of good there may be in the principles set forth herewith.

One would suggest that all the religion in the book has filtered through his mind from some early religious background and training. He is maintaining his belief in God in spite of science, rather than because of it.

One might not feel justified in spending so much time in reviewing the book if it had not come endorsed and highly recommended by the Editorial Committee of the Religious Book Club, consisting of Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, Rt. Rev. Charles H. Brent, Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, and Miss Mary E. Woolley. This means not only that it has reached a large number of min-

isters and laymen, but also that many have accepted it uncritically on the authority of its endorsers, and that for such it will have the effect of further confusing the issue between religion and science and of delaying the solution of the problem.

In thus adversely criticizing the book, we have no desire to question the sincerity either of Professor Mather's purpose or of his religious convictions. But we do wish to assert that any book or any argument which attempts to evolve religion out of natural science, or to set up the findings of natural science as the test of religious truth, is abortive. There is no way "through nature to God," if by "through nature" we mean with no other basis than natural science. The very fact that some natural scientists believe in God and others do not proves that the determining factor in belief is not in natural science. A thorough-going naturalism is irreconcilable with religion. Religion and science can be reconciled, but the reconciliation can be founded only upon the acknowledgment of their true relationship. Both theology and science have made mistakes in their own fields, and especially when they have attempted to impose premature conclusions upon each other. The conflict arose and has persisted not because they are natural enemies, but because all fields of knowledge are inextricably interrelated, and because the correlating principle has not been recognized.

All philosophies of life have arisen from the demand that the universe be rationally explained. Whether the idea has been monistic or dualistic, men have always believed in the existence of a unifying principle; and no philosophy can be satisfactory which does not account for every field of man's experience. Man feels his mental and emotional experiences to be real; moreover he has a very strong intuitive belief that they are prior to and higher than his sense experiences. His whole nature demands a God. Augustine wrote: "Thou hast created us with an impulse towards Thee; therefore our heart is restless until it finds rest in Thee."

From time immemorial, man has believed in God, a spiritual world, and a natural world; and the persistence of this concept in the face of repeated attacks by both science and philosophy is in itself a fact that cannot be ignored. Whatever the current scientific and philosophical journals may be promulgating, the great mass of men, including most of the scientists and philosophers themselves, live according to this concept and its implications.

This is just as true of our own age as of any preceding one. Ours is called an age of enlightenment, and its most conspicuous feature is the achievements in the field of natural science. The concentration upon this field seems to have had a dazzling effect upon many people, and even to have led some to claim that all the light in the enlightenment comes from "science," and that in natural science alone is to be found the complete explanation of the universe. Natural science today might be likened to those who first possessed the secret of the burning-glass, and led the ignorant to believe that they produced fire by magic through their own powers. The achievements of natural science are indeed great and useful; the burning-glass was an invention of far-reaching effects. But as the burning-glass was merely an instrument to achieve certain effects by making use of the rays of the sun, so natural science is merely an instrument for harnessing and utilizing the forces of the natural world. It cannot transcend the realm of nature.

Science is not in search of God. It has no business to be in search of God. The scientist as an individual may and should be in search of God, but he will not find Him through science. Whatever he knows of God has been acquired, whether he acknowledges it or not, through revelation. He may, as Professor Mather does, gracefully avoid the issue by lumping in his acknowledgment all the influences to which his mind has been subject; but such a procedure hardly adds any credit to science. The realms of spirit and of matter are not homogeneous; they are two distinct realms or degrees of life. "If a man sets out from the pre-

suppositions of modern science and thinks 'homogeneously,' he will never come in sight of even the idea of God, and, to use the language of La Place, he will 'have no use for that hypothesis.' " In the interests of science, as well as of religion, let us leave science free to carry on its own work, and cease to demand of it the solution of problems with which it is not equipped to deal. This is a phase of the problem which is often ignored. Professor Mather, for example, is quite ready to condemn the theologians for invading the field of science, but he forgets that quite as much of the conflict has been due to the mistakes of the scientists when they invaded the field of religion. Galileo and Bruno were martyrs not to the cause of scientific accuracy, but to their attempts to develop a philosophy on the basis of their science alone.

This is likewise today the cause of the conflict between science and religion, much of which has come to be centered about the Scopes trial. The people of Tennessee did not object to the teaching of any of the proved facts of science. They objected to the teaching of the theory of materialistic evolution as an observed and well-established fact, recognized as such by every well-informed man. The result of the trial was as much in the interests of true science as in those of religion. Modern science has discovered and arranged a large number of facts concerning life upon the earth over a long period of time. It has considered a number of hypotheses to account for these facts, and has for the time being adopted the theory of evolution as the most probable hypothesis. In scientific literature of the popular variety and in the secondary class-room, this hypothesis promptly appears as a proved fact. Thus it becomes a false premise, upon which a logical superstructure is built which gives the mental and spiritual, as well as the physical, structure of man a purely materialistic explanation, and finally traces all his ideas, including his belief in God, to the effects of his physical environment and his reactions to it, thus making belief in God and in a life after death a mere survival of

the age of ignorance and superstition. The religious man is certainly right in questioning the validity of an hypothesis which leads to such conclusions. He also has the right to demand that an hypothesis as subversive of religion as this be not taught to his children as a fact. The people of Tennessee felt that, however satisfactory the theory of evolution might be in the explanation of natural phenomena, it was proved untenable in the attempt to apply it to the facts of religious experience, in which they were as learned as the scientists. The fact that many do not carry the theory to its logical conclusion, and claim that they are able to believe in evolution and in God at the same time merely proves that, fortunately for them, their religious instincts and training are stronger than their logic. The martyr to true science at the present day is not Mr. Scopes, but the biologist who dares to say openly that "there is not the slightest evidence that any one of the major groups arose from any other."

Up to this point we have been using the word "science" in its most common meaning, referring to that body of knowledge which deals with natural phenomena and their interpretation. "Science," however, may also mean any investigation carried on according to the "scientific method": observation, analysis, systematization, and interpretation of facts. Under this definition, natural science is but one branch of "science," and still has no business to attempt to deal with problems in the religious field, whose science is theology. Religion primarily is a sense of the existence of God and of dependence upon Him. It has its own body of facts entirely apart from the data of natural science. And these facts, like those of natural science, fall into two groups. While natural science has one group of facts concerning the world of matter, and another group concerning man's *reactions* to the world of matter, religion has one group of facts concerning God and the spiritual world, and another group concerning man's reactions to God and the spiritual world, the so-called body of religious

experience. The natural scientist is frequently quite willing to recognize a type of validity in this latter group of religious facts, but he often denies validity to the facts concerning God and the spiritual world. Yet this denial is thoroughly unscientific. To accept man's religious experiences and deny the facts concerning God and the spiritual world is precisely equivalent to studying man's reactions to the natural world, while asserting that we can know nothing of the natural world to which he reacts. Man's religious experiences are largely determined by the type and degree of his knowledge of God and of the spiritual world. This knowledge has been given to men progressively from the beginning until it reached its permanent external form in the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures. There is no logical possibility of holding a genuine belief in God and dodging the fact of revelation. This revelation has been the common heritage of man from the beginning: "As He spake by the mouth of His holy prophets, which have been since the world began." The study and interpretation of this body of revealed facts is the primary task of the science of religion.

It is popular today to urge religion to approach its task through the study of "personal experience". This is exactly what natural science tried to do in its own field in the middle ages. It was only when men stopped trying to evolve their science out of their own inner consciousness and set themselves to study the facts of the natural world that science began to advance. Men have been able to utilize the powers of the natural world in proportion as they have acquired accurate knowledge of it. The modern scientific method applied to religion would dictate a study of the Scriptures as the first requisite for progress—a study of them not merely as natural history, but as the Divine revelation of the mind of God to the mind of man. Much of modern Bible study is based upon the assumption that we are studying in the Scriptures merely the thoughts of men in various ages concerning God. This assumption naturally

makes the so-called "false science" of the Bible crucial for many critics, who conclude, for example, that Joshua's idea of God must be as crude and out-of-date as his natural science, and that therefore the book of Joshua has no message for the modern man. So Professor Mather writes:

> With little realization of the contrast between America in the twentieth century and Palestine during the rise and fall of the Jewish Empire, it is not surprising that we find ourselves in great difficulty when we attempt to preserve such religious concepts as those which were developed in that ancient time and distant place.

Later he makes this attitude still clearer, and ascribes it to the majority of intelligent persons today. He says:

> But the majority of intelligent persons nowadays have a fairly good understanding of the real nature of the Bible. It is not a book, but a collection of books. It is a library of religious and historical documents written by different individuals at different times for different purposes. . . . The chronologic succession of the many documents interwoven in the Bible reveals unmistakably the evolution of one great type of monotheism. . . . Or again, the stories of creation in Genesis reveal something of the ideas which men at one period of Jewish history had concerning the relation of God to man.

This is applying to Bible study a principle which is the exact opposite of that which he elsewhere upholds as the true principle for theology:

> If we grant that it is the business of theology primarily to discover truth and only secondarily to preserve tradition, we cut through the temporary and trivial conflicts to the fundamental relations between science and religion.

The Bible may be studied as natural history, or as revelation, or as both; but one point needs to be insisted upon, namely, that the real meaning of the Bible is not its natural history nor what its human authors thought or intended. It is what the Lord expressed through correspondences. The natural history, or what its authors thought or intended, gives no clue whatever to this real meaning, although it may help us to understand the conditions with which the principle of correspondence worked, and the reason why the

external form of the Bible is what it is. The attempt to discredit revelation by assuming that it can take no definite and permanently applicable form, but is merely a matter of progressive individual insight, is one of the primary causes of the conflict between religion and science.

The opposition between religion and science is not fundamental nor inherent; but no compromise or juggling with terms will do away with it. The solution of the problem depends primarily upon the recognition of the fact that the fields of religion and of natural science are distinct, and that the facts in each are valid. The universe is not monistic, if by "monistic" we mean that it is all matter or all spirit; but it has an underlying unity and is harmonious. If our knowledge of the universe were completely systematized, it would cover every field of experience, whether natural or spiritual. Within this system, all the special sciences would have their proper places; so would the philosophy of nature and the philosophy of spirit. Such a body of knowledge would take in both "science" and "theology," or nature and religion, and would give due weight to inspiration and revelation. When God is recognized, and His purpose in creation is seen, we can say: "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handiwork."

Much of the conflict between religion and science today, as in the past, is due to blind partisanship on both sides, which precludes clear thinking. Immediately upon the appearance of an issue, thousands of "champions" of religion spring up on the one hand, and thousands of "champions" of science on the other. The issue is soon lost sight of in the heat of the battle, and the literature becomes typical war propaganda. The debilitating after-effects are manifest for a long time in both camps. Such partisan efforts must retard, rather than hasten, a mutual understanding, which can be brought about only by consistent and impartial thinking.

Louis A. Dole.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

WHAT IS CHRISTIANITY?

Thoughtful people are asking "What is Christianity?" with a seriousness, a depth, and a breadth, perhaps never before equaled. There are many reasons for this. The most deeply seated reason lies in the conditions of modern life. There never was a time when knowledge was so widely distributed, especially knowledge of current events, and when the ordinary activities of life were so multifarious and absorbing. These conditions are distracting as well as stimulating. The general result is that people are becoming more and more disinclined to concern themselves with seemingly remote interests, and are disposed rather to pursue the satisfactions which abundant present opportunities afford. There is thus a general trend away from deep and systematic thinking (as Helen Keller has said, people of the present day are averse to thinking); and there is a strong reaction against the requirements of custom and tradition, or even of law. The revolt of youth is inspired and sustained by the revolt of age.

Added to the superficial and momentary preoccupations of the day, there is a cast of mind which has been developing under the influence of mechanical invention and scientific achievement that is predominantly naturalistic. This naturalistic cast of mind is so universal that it forms the intellectual atmosphere in which we live and breathe. So all-encompassing and pervasive is this atmosphere that we are for the most part unconscious of it. It has become ingrained in our intellectual temper and habit. It pervades all types of thinking,—religious and social as well as scientific. It requires a deliberate and sustained effort to become aware of it and to shake it off.

We may note here the interesting and important fact that Swedenborg is constantly inveighing against naturalism as the

arch-enemy of religion and spiritual life. He means by "naturalism" that body of thought which proceeds from the belief that all things come from nature, as opposed to the belief that all things come from God. His general doctrine is that nature herself is an effect of the spiritual as the cause. This subordinates nature to spirit, as is done in the Christian doctrine of creation. It is quite in agreement with this doctrine that the naturalism of modern life is fundamentally hostile to religion; and this explains the conflict between religion and science, or more specifically the conflict between naturalism and Christianity.

The situation is complicated and exaggerated by the fact that naturalism has invaded the field of religion, and is undertaking to capture the strongholds of religion. Under the guidance of scientific method and on the basis of scientific results, naturalism pervades the religious philosophy of the day. The study of comparative religion has reduced Christianity to the commonplaces of human emotion and human imagination, with emphasis on the emotions and imagination of so-called primitive savages. In this way the distinctive features of Christianity have been merged into historical parallels, and for it has been substituted a notion of religion in general. This helps to explain the drift in thought and act away from the churches, and the conviction in certain quarters that Christianity is waning, and that it is doomed to extinction. A naturalistic method has been applied to the Bible with the result that the Bible is treated as a mere history of the Jewish people; as a consequence, its authority as Divine revelation and guide to spiritual life has been for multitudes discredited. From the natural history point of view, it would be difficult to convince people that the history of the Jews is any more important than that of the Greeks, or the Romans, or the English. In other words, if we adopt the conclusion that the Bible is merely the outcome of Jewish nature, we shall soon find reasons for neglecting the reading of it, as is now very generally done.

But if we surrender the Church and the Bible, Christianity becomes nothing more than a pagan religion, and men are really

thrown back upon their own rationality and their own impulses as the guide of life. Furthermore, under the attack of naturalism the idea of God has been rationalized into an historic growth, and God Himself has been transformed into a creature of man's imagination, or else into a character of nature, a specially important feature of the environment. With the Christian Church, the Christian Bible, and the Christian idea of God, swept away by the onrushing forces of modern naturalism, what is left of Christianity?

In view of this situation, many earnest and thoughtful men are doing their best to stem the tide. They are attempting to hold on to Christian tradition and to Christian thought, and at the same time to take into account the advances of modern science and modern philosophy. Much of their work is inspiring and helpful, but too often the result is a two compartment mind; one a religious compartment and the other a naturalistic compartment, where the naturalistic compartment does the thinking and the religious compartment furnishes the saving element of the vocabulary. In other words, the defenders of the faith fall victims to the spirit and method of naturalism.

Under these circumstances, the question "What is Christianity?" comes with tremendous force, and with disquieting point. In the current (April) issue of *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick gives the answer which is as typical of present-day thought as any we could select,—not so much perhaps the thought of the professionals, as the common thought of the day. Dr. Fosdick is a gifted orator; he has command of an effective rhetoric; he has an active mind; and he has good control of current ideas. Consequently, he is a popular speaker, and a representative as well as an influential writer. His article is entitled "What is Christianity?"; and the question is answered in the broad light of history. He begins with asking, What are the distinctive features of Christianity? Recalling the results of the study of comparative religion, he points out in succession that the assumed distinctive features of the Christian religion are all reduplicated in other religions. For example, the acceptance of an inspired book is

not peculiar to Christianity: Islam has its Koran; Hinduism has its Rig Veda; and so on. These are held in the same veneration and are interpreted by the same methods as is our Bible. So far all sacred books are alike. Miracles too are a common feature of the various religions. They are "psychological children of the ancient world-view," as he says. They are found in the same forms in other races; they are therefore not peculiar to Christianity. So again the deification of the religion's founder, and the ascription to him of a miraculous birth, are common features of religions,—as in the case of Buddha, Zoroaster, and others. The Second Coming of Christ has its parallel in the expected return of Mahdi among the Mohammedans, and Buddha among the Hindus, and in other cases.

The same holds true of more specific doctrines. "No one can be saved without regeneration" is Christian in sound, but it is a quotation from a pre-Christian Greco-Roman mystery religion. [In fact, it goes back to Pythagoreanism.] These deep-seated and wide-spread resemblances cannot be explained as borrowings. They have psychological explanations which take us back to deeply embedded traits in human experience.

In view of these common features, how can we mark the distinction between Christianity and other religions? What is the particular feature which gives to Christianity its peculiar character? Dr. Fosdick finds this distinctive character in the emphasis which Christianity puts upon personality. In his own language: "Were one to select the special contribution which Jesus of Nazareth himself has made and is making to man's thought, one could do no better than to call him the champion of personality."

Dr. Fosdick has remarkable facility in presenting an idea in various lights, thereby giving it distinctiveness and importance; this is the speaker's and writer's art. He does this in the case of personality, and with his usual impressive effect. But when we follow this development closely, we find that he has done little more than give the idea a rhetorical coloring and a context of eulogistic association. It is quite true, of course, that Christianity has emphasized the importance of personality. But,

as Dr. Fosdick recognizes, other religions and philosophical doctrines have done the same. Socrates did it with a depth of conviction and a clearness of understanding rarely if ever equaled. We have now, under the leadership of the late Professor Borden P. Bowne of Boston University and his successor Professor Edgar S. Brightman, a philosophy of personalism. This philosophy helps us to understand Christianity, and it has a direct bearing upon our idea of God; but it could hardly be said that it gives us the peculiar mark, the essence, of Christianity.

Dr. Fosdick says many true and important things about personality, and gives it a central place in the world of reality. On the other hand, he contrasts the seeming littleness of persons with the immensity of the universe so effectively, that he leaves us with the impression that the significance of personality is asserted against great odds. Dr. Fosdick is much given to taking advantage of contrast effects. In working out these contrasts he is apt to make out a stronger case for naturalism than for religion; religion in his argumentation is too often hardly more than a contrast effect, lacking substantiality of its own. This is illustrated in the article before us. The specific features of Christianity are contrasted with like features in other religions, and in this comparison Christianity loses its distinctiveness and importance. So, too, personality is contrasted with the universe, with the result that the universe seems overwhelming and personality rather impotent. Finally, the Christian idea of God is contrasted with the facts of experience. Here again the facts of experience monopolize the field of knowledge, and God is relegated to the realm of the unknowable. All our ideas of God are but remote symbols. So when we assert that God is personal, we are making use of a symbol. What God really is, we do not know; the best symbol we can use is that of personality. A quotation will best state the position:

> The gist of what the church has meant by the Divinity of Jesus lies in the idea that if God is to be symbolized by personal life, he should be symbolized by the best personal life we know. The interpretation of

the spiritual world in terms of personality, and the interpretation of personality in terms of Christ—this is in brief the summary of Christian theology.

The point of this statement is contained in the expression, "if God is to be symbolized by personal life." This implies that the personal life which Christ was, must be taken as a mere symbol of God; and that God is completely other than Christ. This makes it very difficult to say what Christianity is, and still more difficult to be a Christian. Are we to worship a symbol, or the unknowable which is symbolized? This difficulty is recognized in the words:

The fact is there have never been many Christians. There have been millions of believers in the pagan and semi-pagan accretions which ecclesiastical Christianity has held in common with other faiths, but Christians who shared Jesus' reverence for personality have been few and far between.

We are not asked here to worship the Lord Jesus Christ as God, but to share His reverence for personality. This reverence for personality is affirmed to be the essence of Christianity. In other words, Christianity is reverence for personality. This is the answer Dr. Fosdick has given to the question, What is Christianity?

This outcome is, to say the least, disappointing. But it is more: it is looking for Christianity in what is other than Christ; it is asking us to find Christianity in an idea which we may hold in common with Christ. In other words, we are asked to worship personality as Christ worshiped it; not the personality which Christ was.

If this brief sketch has been successful in presenting Dr. Fosdick's answer to our question at all adequately, we shall doubtless agree that the answer is far from satisfactory. Not only that, but the answer is positively misleading. Strictly speaking it is not a religious answer at all; it does not recognize as the essence of religion dependence either upon God or upon Christ. It is in fact mere self-assertion, the assertion of one's own idea.

What then is Christianity? How does the New Church answer that question?

By definition, Christianity is what relates to Christ; and to be a Christian is to worship Christ. To answer the question in proper religious terms we must begin with the acknowledgment of Christ as God. In all its errors and wanderings, the Christian Church has in the main and in some degree been true to this acknowledgment and worship. In many Christian hymns and sermons, and in much Christian writing, we have beautiful expressions of this acknowledgment and worship. It is true that the acknowledgment is for the most part expressed in figurative language, and is often marred by the idea of God as other than the Lord Jesus Christ; so that there has never been any clear and consistent worship of the Lord as God.

The doctrines of the New Church enable us to make this acknowledgment directly, positively, clearly, and consistently. We depend first of all on the Lord's own teaching in the Gospels. He said to His disciples, "Ye call me Lord, for so I am." There are other statements in the Gospels to the same effect; and there are still others which assert His oneness with God. On the other hand, there are statements which seem to make a distinction between the Lord and God. If we were dependent upon the mere letter, we should have to leave the matter undecided. But we have a doctrine of the spiritual sense which enables us to reconcile these apparently conflicting passages, and to see that they all combine to make clear the teaching that the Lord and God are one and the same person.

This is not the occasion to discuss the matter at length, but it is easy to present an outline. The main difficulty with the Gospel teaching lies in the use of the words "Father" and "Son." The literal and natural interpretation of these words gives us two separate and distinct persons; but the spiritual interpretation enables us to see that they are names for two constituents of one and the same person. It is obvious on reflection that the Lord was not the natural Son of God in the sense that any man is the son of his father. If we understand the relation between the "Father" and the "Son" to be spiritual, then we may see that the father means love, and son means wisdom. It is convenient, though figurative, to say that love is the father of

wisdom, and wisdom the son of love. This interpretation removes the difficulty of two persons. But it may be asked, On what ground is it that the letter of the Gospel is interpreted in this figurative way?

This leads us to a second characteristic of genuine Christianity. Christianity is based upon the Bible as a whole; and it can be shown by spiritual interpretation that the teaching of the Bible from Genesis to Revelation is that the Lord is God. This involves another doctrine which needs to be recognized and justified—the doctrine that the Bible has a spiritual meaning within and above the literal meaning. Here again it is true that in a certain way and degree Christians have from the beginning recognized that the Bible has a spiritual meaning; and many attempts, notably that of Origen, have been made to set forth the spiritual meaning. But history shows that this traditional undertaking has not been successful; and therefore it has been systematically abandoned. Nevertheless Bible readers continue to get some of the spiritual meaning; and this is what gives the reading spiritual life, and makes the Bible to be accepted as the Word of God. In these days, however, this help is largely nullified by naturalistic interpretation.

Heretofore there has been no generally recognized and available principle of interpretation which would guide the reader safely and clearly from the letter to the spirit. We now have such a principle in the doctrine of correspondence, the doctrine of the relation between the spiritual and the natural. This doctrine rests finally upon the basis of observed fact; and it enables us to understand the structure of the Bible. As a matter of experience and observation, there is a correspondence between the natural world and the spiritual. For example, there is a correspondence between the face and the feeling and thought expressed in the face, such that, observing the face, we pass to the feeling of pleasure and approval. So, too, there is a correspondence between the movements, behavior, and conduct of men, and the states of mind that are expressed therein. Further, all manufactured objects, such as houses, machines, implements, etc., correspond to the ideas of those who conceive,

plan, and make them. The statue corresponds to the artist's idea. We may go still further, and observe the correspondence between affection and behavior in all animals. In the case of plants and all material objects the correspondence is not so directly observable; but through the idea that life expresses itself fitly in organism, we may pass to the conclusion that all the objects of nature correspond to the forces of the spiritual world. This conclusion is in general agreement with the Christian doctrine of creation; and it follows from Swedenborg's doctrine that the spiritual world is the world of causes, and the natural world the world of effects.

We may rest assured of the fact and law of correspondence. Now the question is, How does this law apply to the Bible? The Bible is its own evidence that the law of correspondence is embodied in its structure. But the claim that this is done uniquely in the Bible is astounding, and calls for thoroughgoing vindication. The natural history of the Bible does not afford a sufficient clue, and is more apt to put us off the track than to enlighten us. The problem cannot be solved in naturalistic terms. The whole theory of inspiration and revelation is involved. There is one principle that must guide us from the outset; it is that the Lord uses means to communicate His will and life to men. The correspondence between the natural and the spiritual is such a means. The situation is obvious. We have the Lord's affections, thoughts, purposes, and plans on the one hand; on the other we have man's knowledge, experience, and desire to know; and there is the relation of correspondence. There is also the Lord's constant presence and operation with man, and this whether the man knows and acknowledges it or not. Under the impulse of the Lord's presence and design, the man may be disposed and prompted to describe his experience and rehearse his knowledge. He will use his own words, which will refer to the facts of his experience and knowledge. The Lord may for the purpose in view so order the words that they will refer by correspondence to the spiritual and Divine things he wishes to convey to them. We may then by learning the facts and the laws of correspondence pass from the words, the

letter of Scripture, to the spiritual meaning. This, in brief, is what we mean by the structure and formation of the Bible. The verification of this doctrine must come with the use of the Bible in the light of correspondence. We may try the experiment very simply. Take the word "sun," for example, and, having in mind its correspondence to the Lord and to love, go through the Bible from beginning to end, and see how every passage in which the word occurs is lighted up and gets a spiritual meaning. We might repeat the experiment with other words, such as "moon," "stars," "lambs," "olives," etc. A few such experiments will bring enlightenment and conviction. It is true that when we undertake to interpret a chapter (the first chapter of Genesis, say) or a book (as the Book of Exodus), the task becomes exceedingly complicated; but this only means that the understanding of the Bible is a matter of endless progress.

Now to return to our question. We are in the position to say that Christianity is the doctrine and the life based upon it that the whole Bible in its deepest sense is about the Lord alone, and teaches that He is the one only God, from whom we live, move, and have our being.

There is another doctrine which is essential to genuine Christianity. It is what we call the Doctrine of the Glorification. According to this doctrine the Lord by coming into the world took on a complete human nature, which was like the natural man of any Jew; that in this human nature He went through all ordinary human experience, refusing the evil and choosing the good, tempted in all points like as we are. In this way, He completely freed His human nature of evil and imperfection, and made His human will and human thought one with the Divine love and wisdom, which was His inmost from the beginning. In person the Lord was never different from, or other than God; through the Glorification and ascension the humanity within His person became Divine, and He was the one and only person of God. This doctrine, so simply stated in outline, has doubtless many serious difficulties, not only for naturalistic but for spiritual thinking. Many of the terms need interpreta-

tion. But whether understood, or partially understood, or not, the doctrine is essential to Christianity; it is essential to the worship of Christ as God. To think of Jesus as a mere man, however exalted, and as a friend and companion, whom we may admire, imitate, or even worship, is not being a Christian in the full and proper sense. To think of Christ as the Second Person of the Trinity, whether born from eternity or not, and to pray to God for Christ's sake, is not being a Christian in the sense of worshiping the Lord as the one God. The Doctrine of the Glorification enables us to be truly and consistently Christian in the sense of acknowledging the Lord as the only Source of life, and of living from Him alone.

There is still another doctrine that is necessary to the Christianity of today. The spiritual sense of the Bible teaches that the Lord, in a new and more complete approach to men, would come again on a higher level of the spirit. It is essential to Christianity now to acknowledge that the Lord has come in and through the spiritual sense of His Word, and that we live from Him in and through this spiritual sense. The Book of Revelation is that part of the Bible which teaches more specifically this doctrine. There has obviously been much genuine worship of the Lord and living from Him throughout the history of the Christian Church; but the naturalism of the present day is making this more and more difficult. Christian worship, though genuine, has been complicated with natural ideas about the Lord; and under the influences of the day it tends more and more to think of Him as a mere man, quite distinct from and other than God, though in some sense and some degree a manifestation of Him. But Christianity cannot be true to its name and faith, and at the same time tolerate any distinction of person between the Lord and God. Without the acknowledgment of the Lord as the only God, Christianity is doomed to extinction in naturalism; and the naturalistic prophets are saying this in their own way.

To sum up our answer: Christianity is that form of doctrine and life which the Bible teaches in its spiritual sense: specifically, that the Lord Jesus Christ in His Divine Humanity is the

one only God; and that we acknowledge Him and live from Him in His Second Coming in the spiritual sense of His Word.

LEWIS F. HITE.

IDEALS OF LOVE AND MARRIAGE

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, through a Committee on Marriage and Home, which is a department of its Commission on the Church and Social Service, has undertaken a study of Present Conditions Affecting the Home Life of America. The Committee consists of twenty-four distinguished men and women with Bishop James Cannon, Jr., as Chairman, and Rev. Worth M. Tippy, D.D., the Executive Secretary of the Commission, as Secretary of this Committee. This report on the Ideals of Love and Marriage is the fruit of a year's study, and is a careful and authoritative statement, intended to serve as introductory to others that are to follow, such as Recommendations on Training Youth for Marriage, on Safe-guarding Marriage, on the Strains of Marital Relations, Birth Control, the Rights of Children, Unhappy Marriages, and Divorce.

The present report regards the ideals of love and marriage which an individual, or a church, or a people, holds as fundamental to all family relations; and it recognizes the undermining influences now attacking them on the stage, in moving pictures, and in modern literature, and in the disturbed conditions of homes, in the increase of divorce and of apparent laxness in sex-relations. It attributes to the World War the unsettling, at least temporarily, of the ideas and customs relating to sex; and to daily newspapers the continuance of this mischief in the intimate details of sex intrigue and resulting tragedies, set forth in such a manner as to play upon the sex emotions of the young.

But the church itself, after taking full account of its great services rendered to family life, is found to be not without fault in having failed to give pastoral oversight and practical instruction in these very important matters of social well-being.

Comparatively few pastors and churches have given attention to these problems of the unadjusted home. Few pastors have been careful about safeguarding the marriages they celebrate, and teaching the meaning of Christian marriage, and showing the help which is to be found in religion in attaining its ideal.

The emancipation of woman from the injustice of the past, and her entrance upon conditions of independence, are making great changes in the home, and the social customs which surround courtship and marriage. But she is still at a disadvantage and in revolt against some remaining unjust laws and customs. The disturbance is universal, with its causes reaching far into the past; but some of the deeper causes lie in the differing natures of men and women, which will always make the maintenance of a successful home a high accomplishment demanding the best that is in men and women.

Hence the value of ideals of love and marriage which are always leading on to higher attainments. The custody of these ideals, and of the spiritual forces which make their progressive realization possible, is with organized religion. The church's ideal should be kept as high and pure as the doctrine of Christ. That this ideal is practical is shown by the lives of numbers of married couples who have lived beautifully and happily together. The church's great work is to teach positively and effectively the ideal given by the Lord.

Monogamy, the Christian law of marriage, has been recognized as the basic form by most anthropologists. Polygamy has disappeared from Western civilization. Concubinage of the Chinese type was abolished in Japan in 1880. Prof. H. S. Jennings says, "The monogamous family, with life-long union of the mates, appears as the final term in a long evolutionary series." A free woman, on the plane of equality and self-respect, can be the lifemate of one man only; nor can she tolerate the thought of sharing her husband with another.

The American ideal is monogamous. Countless young people have seen in marriage an inspiring vision of devotion and life-long companionship between one man and one woman. Most of our young people love like that at one time or another, and all of

them desire to do so. They enter into a relationship in marriage which to them has been deeply rooted in sex, which they have thought of as natural but at the same time as spiritual. These experiences they expect to culminate, as they normally should culminate, in the joys and responsibilities of parenthood. Ideally there could be no extra-marital sex relationships, either before or after marriage; and the union was expected by both husband and wife and by society to endure until death. Difficulties and hardships were expected as a matter of course; but they were accepted as a part of the undertaking, and were to be met and overcome or endured.

Now this is also the Christian concept of marriage as stated by our Lord Himself in words of extraordinary depth and power. A man, He said in the Sermon on the Mount, is not to think adultery in His heart. He is to discipline himself as he would pluck out an offending eye. A man and a woman in marriage become one flesh, the union is organic; and it is God who unites them, which means that it is a profound biological-spiritual experience which comes out of the depths of life. The union is for life: "What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."

The report holds that love between the sexes and the love which expresses itself in religion are closely related. But it goes on to say that it does not mean that the emotional desires accompanying sex and that splendid love for God and mankind which is the glory of religion, have the same source; but rather that the devoted and enduring love of one man and one woman for each other is like the love of God; and that the realization of such a love is akin to religious experience.

This is the only vestige found in the report of the devastating falsity of the past which has been the cause, more than anything else, of destroying the purity and beauty of human marriage: the falsity which still lingers in the celibacy of the Roman Catholic Church teaching that marriage in itself is not pure and clean, but is tolerated by the Lord for the sake of offspring to populate the earth; that it is better not to marry, that the continence of priests and *"holy* women" is better in the Divine

sight. This is one of the great abominations that the Lord in His Second Coming is now overthrowing. And it is one of the signs that His Second Coming has taken place, not in literal clouds but in symbolic clouds of the letter of His Sacred Scriptures, that only a disappearing vestige of it is found in this report on the Ideals of Love and Marriage made by a Committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. The truth is that the love and marriage of one husband and one wife completes the "image and likeness" of God in the human race. Chastity does not begin to be realized, and can never begin to be realized, as an element of human character, without genuine marriage. Genuine marriage has its origin in the union of the Divine Love and Divine Wisdom in God the Creator Himself. The Sacred Scriptures are full of references to marriage in the Creator descending into all things of His creation; and finally He is described as the Bridegroom and Husband of His Church described as the bride and wife. All the processes of creation, or generation, in God and in men take place by the marrying of love and wisdom, of will and understanding, of goodness and truth, of masculine and feminine elements; and so all the processes of regeneration take place. Marriage is at the very heart of religion; "the splendid love for God and mankind which is the glory of religion" is born of marriage in the soul and in the body, in the spirit and in the flesh, purified of selfishness and lust by the regenerating Spirit of the heavenly Father. Such marriage receives its increase from His blessing pronounced upon it.

And another great and devastating falsity of the past has been in the teaching that marriage and sex are unworthy of a place in heaven, and that angels are sexless, a separate order of creation; and that men and women will be made like them in the resurrection, sexless. The truth is that sex is of the soul as well as of the body. Lust is of the body; love is of the soul, and marriage-love is the soul of all other kinds of love—into its bosom from the Creator flows the love of God and of men which is the glory of religion. Genuine marriage is "the jewel of human life and the store-house of the Christian religion."

In the Sacred Scriptures we receive a revelation of the creation of man and woman, but nothing of the creation of angels. Men and women by faithfulness in marriage become angels, messengers of the Lord.

The report under consideration approaches this great truth of the Divine origin and destiny of the ideals of love and marriage. It speaks of the relationship between the sexes as part of a larger order, linked with belief in God and in the purposefulness of the universe, with sacrifice, with the struggle for human life, and with the higher idealism and faith of mankind, which finally persist or perish together.

The report continues, saying, the intense emotions with which marriage begins must be transmuted into something hardier and more spiritual. It cites Keyserling as having pointed out that true marriage is a state of fine spiritual tension between two intelligent beings who must maintain themselves in a relationship which makes great demands upon character. Nothing can be taken for granted. The one who sees most must give most, and possibly suffer most. Great practical tasks, increasing in difficulty with age and waning strength, have to be faced and conquered, or marriage to that extent is a failure. The question is raised whether happiness should ever be made the primary object of any human relationship, although happiness may come unsought along the pathway of loyalty and duty. Young married people should be encouraged to continue to be lovers, but they should be instructed in the higher reaches and social demands of marriage, and in the transmutations that must take place if it is to succeed. A resolute will to succeed no matter what comes, a refusal to yield to difficulties that are inevitable, are of great importance to strong home ties.

Marriage demands the cultivation of common tastes and interests. Swedenborg calls it "abiding in similitudes and avoiding dissimilitudes." The report dwells upon the necessity of this under the general heading of a "larger freedom in marriage"—husbands and wives should not impose their peculiar interests too much upon each other, but should allow each considerable latitude of development. But we cannot ignore the fact that marriage is in two lives coming together and living

together; going separate ways, to that extent, makes marriage a failure. Similiarity of tastes and interests are what should lead to marriage, not dissimilarity. But we agree with the report, that after the marriage has taken place the right way for the couple is to be faithful to it during life in this world, and give each other freedom, abiding in similitudes as far as possible.

Religion in the home is of greatest importance, according to the report; and of course we entirely agree to it. It should burn continually upon the family altar. It is a very great need in our day. It is helped by the habit of church-going, and by family prayers, and by grace at meals. The home is doubly secure when the husband and wife keep their ideals with God's strength; when the children learn to pray at the mother's knee; and they hear their father's voice in prayer; and the family go to church together. The child needs the divinest home the earth can give. He lives by love as much as by food and drink.

The report speaks of sex-allurements outside of the home as destructive of marriage; and then goes on to consider the suggestion of companionate marriage as a cure for sex-waywardness. Such marriage has been proposed as a remedy for the great evil of pre-marital sex-experience by the young, to relieve the strain of sex instinct when young people, for economic conditions, or because they are students, are unable to enter into early marriages. It includes the idea of trial marriages. It also has in view the new economic independence of women who desire a form of marriage which will allow them greater freedom. And it is to meet the needs of those who want to marry, but must both continue to work unhampered by the care of children. It involves legal marriage, knowledge of birth control, legal divorce by mutual consent at any time unless children are born, and without alimony unless in the judgment of the court there are reasons for it. The two young people may live in separate homes or together as is customary with marriage. It is expected that it will be entered into with love and courtship, and with desire for a life-long union, even with religious sanctions, and with the purpose of having children when circumstances warrant; and that in most cases it will become permanent. But in any event it will show the young people

whether they can live together happily, and whether it is advisable for them to have children, or not.

The report objects to companionate marriage because it puts sex-desire first. Sex-desire, though one of the normal instincts of the body and one of the most powerful, never should be put first. To put it first degrades the mind and sex itself also. Sex-experience is elevating and wholesome only when it is under moral control, and when it is transmuted into a spiritual experience by love and devotion. Companionate marriages give a wrong start by providing wrong ideals; the start is self-regarding, and raises doubts as to the future. This is psychologically unfortunate, and puts marriage on a distinctly low level.

The questions of divorce by mutual consent and of birth control are receiving further investigation and study by the Committee. A further report upon them is promised when these studies are completed. But in the meantime some very important suggestions to ministers and churches are made in this report. For instance:

> The church should lift up with all its power the Christian ideal of marriage, and should throw about it every possible religious sanctum.
>
> It should emphasize the sterner obligations of marriage, the difficulties which may be expected, and develop the will to meet them.
>
> The ideal of marriage for life is the only union for the church to teach.
>
> Divorce, even when allowed by the church, must be looked upon as a tragic and humiliating failure.
>
> Marriage which has children in mind, the right of children to a happy home, the joys of parenthood and the great meaning of marriage for the enrichment of life, must have a new place in preaching and in the entire program of the church.

In conclusion, let us remember what a wealth of truth is provided for the Church of the Lord's Second Coming, and let us have a growing realization of the world's great need of these teachings, and let us teach them with renewed earnestness in view of this report. The Lord promises to make all things new. Nothing is in so great need of being made new as marriage, which is the "great jewel of human life, and the repository of the Christian religion."

H. Clinton Hay.

BIBLICAL AND DOCTRINAL STUDIES

TWO PARTS IN LIFE

There are in life two parts. One part is made up of deliberate effort, of painstaking thought and planning, of steady work. This is the part in life where a man has a sense that he lives from himself. He who is so accustomed to this life that he has no room for any other erects this sense into a dogma of self-sufficiency. Presently he feels himself to be aloof from men and hostile to them. There is an element of this in all our lives. We all share the sense of being alive from ourselves. But there is also the other part in life. It has a heart, a thought and energy also, but they bring with them a reality that the first does not have. The heart is warmer and the thought deeper; aware of the purpose of our life, the energy spent brings with it a sense of accomplishment, a sense that our work is worth while. The first is the part of man, the second is the part of the Lord Jesus Christ in human life.

Indeed the Lord Jesus Christ reigns over the whole of human life, but in our human part we fail to recognize His rule. He veils His rule that man may feel his own master and also that he may see his lack and his shortcomings and freely seek for the Lord his God. So in much of our conscious existence we do feel our own masters. But in our most genuine feelings, in our deepest thought, in the victory of accomplishment, which comes to bless our life, we are brought to recognize the higher source, the creative part of the Lord. The stress today is on the human part. Human responsibility has a new meaning in a new material world. Take the home. We are often reminded of the disintegration of the home today, but is there not a new family spirit growing by its side? Today family life seems to be a science. The field of choice has grown so tremendously. The father and the mother, the husband and the wife, feel it their

duty to choose the best to furnish the minds of their children as well as the rooms of their house. Where will they turn? What will they buy? Where is the right school, the right club, the right companionship for those they love? With all his new mastery of the world, how heavy the burden of responsibility on man's shoulders! Much heavier than before. How greatly needed is the truth that man's life is not self-sufficient. What a blessing would be to each and all the discovery of the Lord's part in life. The opening words of Psalm 127 point to this discovery: "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it: except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain."

This Psalm does not speak of things impractical, unrelated to our life. To build and to keep! What could better sum up the practical ambitions of a man? Man builds his business, he builds his family and his home. His success in life is to build them securely. Once he has built he must keep them, repair the daily wear and tear, organize and administer the works of his hands. What beyond this? Build further out, go on building, organizing, repairing, keeping. Still he is not satisfied with the practical routine. He wants something new, something better and finer. Where will he find it? Right at this point the Psalm takes the part of the Lord within our practical life. It proclaims the truth that life within us, the life we used to busy ourselves building and keeping this world, is a continual creation, a continual making new. "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." His is all building. "Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain." His is the work of repairing and organizing. His is the keeping. And even while the workman sleeps, the Lord is active in him; He builds, He keeps his soul, his mind, his strength. "It is vain for you to rise up early, to sit up late, to eat the bread of toil: for so He giveth His beloved sleep." What then is the part of the Lord in our life? Why is our part vain and futile without His? How does He build houses and keep cities?

The answer is: He gives our work a soul. As long as there is no soul in it, there are no real results; for results are a body,

and a body cannot exist without a soul. This soul in our work is a creation of the Lord. Seen from the outside and through our part in it, life appears like one continuous round of routine. It seems drab with grind work. But what seen from the inside, through His part in our life? It is ever new. Every day new feelings, new motives, new purposes, new ideas to work out, new strength, new material to mold or to analyze. This is the new soul that stirs in us every morning, and prompts us to do our part as best we can through another day.

The question then arises: Is there need for builders? Is there need for watchmen? Is there need for human effort? Indeed there is. The Psalm takes account of them. They are with us engaged in the human part of life. Their work makes room for the creative action of the Lord. The mortar and the steel must be handled with human hands. Men put in doors and windows and all manner of appliances into their houses, but the Lord creates the home and supplies the life in it. Men build schools and write books, but the heart and thought that speak in them are a creation of the Lord. In your work the power that accomplishes is ever new. There is an ever-flowing stream of life that seeks expression through your eyes, your mouth, your hands and all your body. Indeed the soul of the work is put thereinto through the efforts of the worker. The Lord needs open-hearted and clear-minded men and women to help Him build houses and keep cities in this world.

Think over a span of years. Consider the way you have traveled. There have been material and mental problems. You spent effort to overcome them. But see! There have also been new friendships, new ambitions, new ideas, high truths that you learned, peaks of achievement. Through your careful work you made room for new things. As you worked, you fulfilled your part. But the Lord fulfilled His part: the greatest achievement of these years is this, that you are new. You know that you are different from what you were fifteen, twenty or twenty-five years ago. You know from experience that victory comes in struggle as a surprise to him who struggles. It seems to be given, not through the laborious effort, as a patient conclusion,

but freely. Is this not the reason for the bit of popular wisdom, that if one "keeps at it" long enough, "things are bound to break" for him? There is an opening to him who will fight his way to it. The "break" in your favor, the opening, the achievement that you desire, your new self—these are a creation of the Lord.

We know then from experience the truth of the words of the Psalmist: "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it: except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain." The truth of these words is the truth of a law of our spiritual life. There is more than one house for man to keep. There is more than one community of houses, or city, for him to keep in good order. There are the houses without that we build and own. There are the houses within that we build and are. There are the cities without that we inhabit and rule with our municipal laws; there are the cities within that rule our conduct with their order. The house in spirit is that wherein you are most at home, in your spiritual life. It is your heart. The city in spirit is the system of ideas that you have taken as true, the teachings that you have accepted for your guidance. The truth is that the Lord uses every experience of our life to build within us a will that would make the most of the life that comes from Him, a heart that can hold love to the neighbor and love to the Lord. It is He who keeps the city of our minds, that of all that we see, of all that we hear, of all that we learn by experience or from books, there may come a greater intelligence of the truth He brings, the truth of service to the neighbor.

When David prayed "Create within me a clean heart, O Lord, and renew a right spirit within me," he prayed for a living religion. We are to remember the word "create" which he uses, that we may use it in prayer. In every man born anew there is this new creation. Our heart and our mind naturally are self-centered. The whole of regeneration—and that is the whole of our life in its religious value—is the making of a new and living heart, and a new and living mind. They are no longer centered on what is good for us, what is dear and precious to

us, what is right to our judgment, but on what is good and dear and right to our fellow men. This is the house that the Lord builds, this is the city that He keeps.

Our human part in spiritual life is to refuse every selfish purpose and every selfish thought, to stop ourselves from doing the hurtful deed, because they are dead and evil in the eyes of the Lord. Ours it is to study how we can help our neighbor as intelligently as possible. But we cannot make ourselves love our fellow men. This love is life to our heart. It is of the Lord: "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." Our very knowledge of truth is mere information, till the Lord breathes into it the soul of life, understanding of our fellow men, sympathy with their needs, light to see how we can use what we believe. "Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain."

The same law of spirit prevails in every other experience of a living religion. In marriage man and woman pledge their love and their faith to each other. But as they go through life together, and are true and unselfish towards one another, it is the Lord who creates their one life with all its delight and strength. The Lord alone marries the man and the woman.

In business life and in the life of the nation our insight reveals to us the Lord's part, His creative mind at work. Once man has done his best, does He not bring success? At the critical times of the life of a people, has He not raised great men to lead their countrymen? When the spirit of a race dies, does He not bring a new race to take the leadership of civilization? Every new discovery, every new field of activity, such as aviation, brings the Lord's part to light. Indeed there have been human pioneers, but the achievement is too great even for their great minds. A step forward in human civilization means a new lease on life to millions of minds. One and One only can give life more abundant.

In church life we need that the Lord should build us a new heart, to care for our neighbor in his struggles. We need that the Lord should train our minds, through His truth, that we may intelligently love our fellow men and Him, Who is our

God. We need Him to teach us not merely to know, but to understand and to do.

Through all life it is for us to fill our part. With the strength that the Lord gives us day by day let us keep His laws, refuse all evil and all deceit, make ourselves work constructively. Let us be builders of life. Let us also be very careful of the life of our fellow men, for it is the most precious object of care in this world. Let us be keepers of life. Let us be faithful doers of our part. But let us never lose that freshness of heart and of sight that children have, to whom there is no routine, to whom everything is wonderful and new. Let us be careful not to allow ourselves to carry the cares of our life, the cares of this world, the cares of our Church on our shoulders. Let us be careful not to allow our hearts and our minds to harden. It is not for us to give or to withhold life. Let us keep our minds alive to the Lord's creative part. We must be helpers, but the work is the Lord's work. How thrilling it is to witness His creation of new hearts and of new minds, of new ideas, of new energy, of new results in our world and in the world about us, for life is forever new. "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it: except the Lord keep the city the watchman waketh but in vain."

André Diaconoff.

NEIGHBOR AND WORLD COURT

The law governing man's relation to his neighbor as contained in the Second Great Commandment reaches so far, in so many directions, that there is no exhausting what there is to know about it or to practice in accordance with it.

In the story of the Good Samaritan we see an individual aspect of it. We trace there the implications of our Lord's words to the lawyer about the man who fell among the thieves by the Jericho road, and discover definitely that the "neighbor" is the good there is in one, or at least that is possible for one. For, as you remember, the Lord called the Good Samaritan the

"neighbor," rather than the needy man whom he helped, asking the question, "Which now of these three thinkest thou was neighbor *unto him* that fell among the thieves?" It was the good there was in the man that made him good to the other man in need, that is to say, made him "neighbor unto him"!

All this is important to enable us to know how most intelligently, and so most effectively, to practice this service of love to our fellow men individually.

But the law extends beyond the problem of individual relationships, which are, comparatively speaking, quite simple. *Groups* of men, smaller, and larger, are as much the neighbor as individuals are. In the doctrines of the Church the matter is stated thus:

> Man is neighbor not only in the singular, but also in the plural. For a society, less or greater, is our neighbor; our country is; the Church is; the Lord's kingdom is, and above all, the Lord is. . . . These are the ascending degrees of the neighbor; for a society of many is neighbor in a prior degree to one individual man; our country is in a prior degree to a society; in a degree still prior is the Church, and in a degree still prior is the Lord's kingdom; but in the highest is the Lord. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 6819.)

And again:

> A society is the neighbor above an individual man, because it consists of many. Toward it charity is to be exercised in a similar way as toward an individual man, *namely, according to the quality of the good which is with it;* thus quite differently toward a society of the upright from toward a society that is not upright. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 6819.)

That is to say, the manner of doing good to it must vary according to the character of it. Again, listen to this:

> It is believed in the world that a brother, kinsman or relation, is more the neighbor than one not related; and that he who is born in one's own country is more the neighbor than one born out of the country. But every one is neighbor according to his good, be he Greek or Gentile. (Doctrine of Charity, n. 75.)
>
> A society, smaller or larger, is the neighbor according to the good of its use. (*Ibid.*, n. 78.)
>
> If a society perform distinguished uses it is more the neighbor; if unimportant uses it is less the neighbor: if evil uses it is no otherwise the neighbor than is an evil man,—whose good I desire, that he may become

a good man, and, so far as possible, provide means for his improvement —even though it be by threats, chastisement, penalties, and privations. (*Ibid.*, n. 79.)

This last observation brings us to the consideration of a possibility too little attended to. Namely, that the group of which we form a part, may, at least on occasion, be performing evil uses: and this, whether it is our business organization, our club, our city, our state, or even our nation! And our duty toward it changes according as its quality of action swings toward good or evil. For, if every human group, small or large, "is the neighbor according to the good of its use," it is a law which must hold good with our own group, and our obligations toward it. Application of the law in such instances may sometimes prove very perplexing, and very embarrassing. It involves the possibility that true neighbor-love for our own group, even our country, may sometimes impose upon us the necessity of opposing it. And the declaration is specifically made:

> Our country is the neighbor according to its spiritual, moral, and civil good. (Doctrine of Charity, n. 83.)

That the same relations should exist between nations as between individuals, is said in a somewhat striking way in a passage in one of the *Psalms* (ix: 19, 20). It is this:

> Arise, O Lord. . . .
> Let the nations be judged in Thy sight.
> Put them in fear, O Lord,
> That the nations may know themselves to be but men.

Thus is emphasized what is the plain implication of the Bible throughout: that the laws of God for men are laws of God for nations. This is so with the Ten Commandments, and with the Golden Rule. In fact, it is by a nation's observance of these laws (or its violation of them) that the nature of our obligation to it is determined; even to our own country. The only way that we can truly help our own nation, or any other, is by helping it to keep these laws, both in its dealings with its own citizens, and in its dealings with other nations.

The law, therefore, that we must love our neighbor as ourselves, applies to our nation in the same manner as it does to individuals, only, of course, being of greater urgency in the proportion that the nation's welfare is of greater importance than the individual's.

And "in the widest sense of all, the neighbor is the human race" (Charity, n. 87). But the expression of our neighborliness toward that part of the human race outside our own nation—that is to say, in other nations—must be rendered, for the most part, through our national Government,—thus, from our nation to their nations. This fact does not exempt us, however, from the obligation. For, obviously, we have a responsibility in the matter. To the degree of our possible influence we are responsible for our country's behavior toward other nations.

Obvious as this obligation is, under the command to love the neighbor, yet it is only since the breaking out of the World War that the populace in general has become aware of it; or, for that matter, has had such responsibility in any large measure, and in definite applications, openly put up to it to pass upon.

This open recognition of so vast a field of neighbor-obligation, which within the infinitesimal time-span of ten years has taken a hold upon the world, is, it seems to me, one of the most striking demonstrations of the actuality of the New Age we have loved to believe, and teach, has been born upon the earth. This Greater Neighbor, known in the Church as "The Grand Man," has, of course, a theological and spiritual aspect, which again, of course, the world as yet knows little of. But that the multitudes are now seeing it in *practice,* in a condition of world necessity, is matter of the most far-reaching significance. It is not strange, perhaps, that multitudes are stunned by the bigness of the concept, and as yet are not able to follow through where it calls. Yet the discovery once made, will not be unmade. And the call once heard, will continue to reverberate around the world. It is the challenge to all who answer to the voice of the Lord in anything, to carry their practice of the law of neighbor-love through to the end of its vastest implications.

The nations *must* know themselves to be "but men." And they *must* know that they *must* act toward one another as men must act toward one another. The law for one is the law for the other.

When we come to the anniversary of that memorable date in world history on which the Armistice was signed, which stopped the machinery of the World War, we still have a sense of shadows across the date which makes it more than evident that that day calls for something more from the people of the once Allied Nations than mere self-congratulations. The world still hangs too uneasily over a precipice for us to spare time in such an idle vein—even if we were inclined to do it.

In the throes of the fiery life-and-death struggle we experienced the wonderful efficiency of cooperation, and as well the precious emotions of good-will which went hand in hand with it. And it seemed to many of us then as if, so long as any semblance of rational power remained to the mind of man, that cooperation and mutual regard must be made the deliberate policies of these nations, and must thence in due time extend to all the rest upon the face of this small planet.

But today, as we look back over the years since that day, we wonder which of the peoples represented in that victorious event can look with pride, or even with passing satisfaction, upon their nation's behavior within this time! Which of them can feel that it has so acted toward the others that it has made actual contribution toward the stabilization and peace of the world? This is not said as a blanket accusation of all the nations; but in the spirit of the question mark which looms so large from our particular place of vision.

Never were words spoken better fitting to these nations once banded together in war, and then banded together in victory, than the words of Franklin to the groups within the then tentative United States of America; namely these: "We must all hang together, or we shall all hang separately"!

If proof were needed by beings supposed to be rational, that the time has come when the nations of the earth must live together under mutual understanding and unfeigned good-will,

—must be genuinely *neighborly*,—or else go down with a crumbling of civilization, that proof has been the record of the years since the supreme thanksgiving day of the Armistice signing.

During the period of allied cooperation there was, beyond a doubt, I think, in the hearts of the peoples themselves within these nations, a feeling of mutual affection, a realized new-found brotherhood, and a tide of great joy in the experience. International neighbor-love had come to birth in the hearts of many peoples, and for a season made amazing and inspiring growth.

This might well have gone on growing, we believe, had the spokesmen of these Governments kept themselves true to the hearts of their peoples. However that may be, wherever the blame may lie, the significant fact remains, that where love has once reigned, if suspicions be planted, and then hatreds develop, the state of things which will follow will always be indefinitely worse for all concerned than the conditions were before the love developed. It is right here that the greatest peril the world yet has seen stands now in sight.

Some things have been lost in these years which cannot be regained. Some opportunities have gone for ever. But there is still time to save the world from utter self-destruction, if the so-called Christian nations will but honestly return to an effort to practice the law of neighbor-love. And if then to this effort they will add even a little intelligence, great wars can surely be avoided for the future.

Would any man now in possession of his reason, ask us to go back to the time when every man was a law unto himself, and the only final arbiter in disputes was the fear of one another's marksmanship? And if individuals have found a way so much more human whereby they can adjust their differences, as they have found in delegated power of legislation, and in the courts, why should not the nations—who are but larger men—employ the same humane, and let us say human, way? The unexplainable question seems, Why did they not do it generations ago? Why wait until they *must* do it, or else go into oblivion under

the rapidly growing weight of their own engines of human destruction?

Are the Christian people of this land going to allow their Government indefinitely to stand aloof from such international instrumentalities as are developed to function for this only rational method of handling questions that must always be arising between nation and nation? Can it be that they are going to allow the misrepresentations of some openly anti-Christian politicians to keep them from the supreme opportunity and call of their history, to have practical part in the largest possible expression of the law of love to the neighbor? I have the faith to believe that they are not going to lend themselves as tools of such low ambitions.

If we have national laws, why not international laws? And since we cannot have national laws without national law *makers,* so we must have international law *makers.* And since these national laws must have courts to interpret them, so international laws must have a court to interpret them. There is no other way, unless we choose to follow the barbarian custom of every man traveling all his miserable life long armed to the teeth for self-defense, and for worse, always suspected and often hated by every neighbor. Think of what will be said of us by the historians of another hundred years. Can they say anything better than something to this effect: That the nations for something more than nineteen hundred years of Christian light, lived among themselves very much as the beasts of the jungles live, every one a law unto itself, and so not ruled by intelligence and law, but by emotions and passion? And yet that the strongest of these had power enough to change it over night if they would; and they called themselves *Christian nations!* Nations under bonds to love their neighbors as themselves!

Since nations, like individuals, are to be dealt with under this law of neighbor-love according to the quality of the good they themselves try to practice, I can see no possible way of accomplishing this without an international tribunal which shall have the authority vested in it by those who function under it, to judge their measure of right or wrong in specific matters, where

neighbor-love must be in terms of definite actions. If the present instrumentalities for accomplishing this end are not perfect, that is not reason for our staying out of them; but rather—if we are looking for a real chance to serve—to get into them and lend our best help to making them better. We shall never get anywhere by refusing to lift a hand toward stopping the leak in the dike in this twentieth century civilization because we are not supplied with automatic twenty-fifth century dike-repairing machinery.

There is only one thing that can justify us in staying out. That is the genuine, fact-founded, unprejudiced, and thought-out conviction that we can truly be of more real help to the world of nations by staying apart, than we could be by working with them. It is that that the Church asks of its members. And only that. The rest is a matter of judgment. And let every man make that for himself, not borrowing the judgment (often only opinion) of another man. In the name of the Lord Who in His commission to us said, "By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another," and, "love your neighbor as yourselves,"—in His name we say to every Christian: In your heart of hearts do not treat this matter lightly. But search for light. Make up your minds what is right for your nation to do. Then use your powers of influence, your prayers, your votes if it waits for them, to cause your nation to act in this matter in the way which you thoroughly believe will be in furtherance of that command, as applied among the nations,—the greatest human neighbor,—to love the neighbor as ourselves. God grant that the outcome may be, shall be, a Christian outcome!

EVERETT K. BRAY.

CURRENT LITERATURE

AS THE WORLD SAW SWEDENBORG.*

The studies which comprise "Swedenborg's Historical Position" appeared first in the NEW-CHURCH REVIEW, the seven installments extending from April, 1926, to October, 1927. In the attractive volume to which they have now, quite justly, attained, the materials form three essays,—the topics: The Greatness of Swedenborg; Testimonies of Personal Acquaintances; and Some Recent Testimonies.

Professor Hite spared time and strength from his metaphysical pursuits for twenty years' service as Secretary of the American New-Church Evidence Society; and the studies here collected constitute a permanent witness to the value of the Evidence Society, and of our revered philosopher as its Secretary. The book will be indispensable to all intelligent receivers of the Heavenly Doctrines, as well as to that increasingly large company of well-disposed persons who regard Swedenborg as truly one of the world's greatest. As Mr. Hite remarks in his Preface, the "sectarian opposition and naturalistic prejudices" which have in the past militated against a fair hearing for the sage have "gradually waned." Though what Henry James was pleased to speak of as the "sect of the *soi-disant* New Jerusalem" has not noticeably increased in numbers or strength, it seems a fact that a knowledge, however vague and misinformed, that Swedenborg was a genius of many interests and amazing achievement,—a scientist, an inventor, a philosopher, and a seer —is more widespread than ever before. And surely, so far, so good. Mr. Hite's book will serve admirably to introduce those who have *heard* of Swedenborg to an ampler conception of his intellectual magnitude.

**Swedenborg's Historical Position.* By LEWIS FIELD HITE. Boston: Massachusetts New-Church Union. 1928. 174 pp., 8vo. Price, $1.25.

It is from a pardonable point of view distressing that a man of Swedenborg's versatile genius should require to be introduced or authenticated or rendered respectable intellectual pabulum by men who were in no sense his equal—by Edward Everett Hale and Lyman Abbott and John Bigelow; or, to come nearer home, that Madame Galli-Curci's deservedly eminent position among contemporary singers should be used for purposes of Swedenborgian "publicity." But what is one to do? Ludicrous as the appeal to a lesser authority in behalf of a greater may justly seem, it is probably useful. And perhaps when the gods arrive, the half-gods, their propædeutic office at an end, will effect an unperceived departure.

Every student of culture will be interested in the pages which concern the connections of Swedenborg with such leaders (half-blind as they were) of nineteenth century thought as Kant, Coleridge, and Emerson (I apologize to Kant for putting him in the same series as the "literary men"). The readers of the REVIEW will be able to supplement the material on Emerson's acquaintance with Swedenborg from Professor Clarence Hotson's Harvard doctoral dissertation on the subject, a second installment of which appears in this number.

Professor Hite has not merely collected and arranged the interesting testimonies of others, but, in his essay on the Greatness of Swedenborg, he has contributed an admirably succinct and luminous survey of his subject's parts and powers. He has further enriched his volume with frequent and always scholarly bibliographical and biographical notes. Too often Emerson and Coleridge have been quoted in praise of Swedenborg without the documentation necessary to make the reference verifiable. Each of Mr. Hite's citations is properly located, a procedure which attests the soundness of the work.

The volume is fittingly dedicated to the author's father, Hugh Holmes Hite of Virginia, "my first teacher in Swedenborg's philosophy, and the constant inspiration of all my subsequent studies."

It is gratifying to all admirers of the character and work of Lewis Field Hite to have a selection from his studies given the

dignity of publication in book form. But his admirers would feel still more pleasure should some munificent New-Churchman see his way to insuring the publication of a volume or two of Mr. Hite's original works. The masterly Congress address on "Ultimate Reality"—its author's richest production, and quite unrivalled in its kind—should surely be reprinted along with other papers in development of Swedenborg's metaphysics. And while we are in the business of wishing, let us put in a request also for a volume of his more professional and technical studies in metaphysics and epistemology and science.

The way of the philosopher is not an easy one. Philosophy bakes no bread; butters no parsnips; contributes not a whit to the bustle of the market place. The speculations of the metaphysician seem futile to the "practical," redundant to the "scientific," and arid to the "literary." In spite of discouragement and lack of encouragement, our dear philosopher, whose life so beautifully illustrates his doctrine, has persisted on his way, faithful to his vocation. It is a pleasure to pay this brief tribute to a great thinker and a great man.

Austin Warren, Ph.D.

Boston University.

"TOPICS FROM THE WRITINGS"*

A good collection of topics from the Writings would obviously be a convenient and important help in learning what the writings teach. The difficulty in making such a collection would be to select comprehensive statements on the several topics, so that each would be sufficiently covered; and this would involve rather lengthy treatment in the case of a large collection. Another requirement would be that the topics should be arranged in some logical order.

**Topics from the Writings.* By William Frederic Pendleton, D.Th. Bryn Athyn, Pa.: Academy Book Room. 1928. 249 pp., 8vo. $2.00.

The book before us is an interesting and valuable collection of "Topics." On the whole, there is apparently no effort to arrange them in logical order, although there are some groups of ordered topics. For example we have "The Natural Sun is Dead," "The Worship of the Sun," "Vital Heat." These are connected by the common thought of the Sun. There are about four hundred and fifty "topics" covering a very wide range and variety of subject matter. The aim is to give the central thought, or teaching, of each topic. This is done either in the language of the Writings or in the language of the author, which is little more than a paraphrase. We miss interpretation and expansion, and accordingly the thought is left usually in a bare, abstract form. Take the case above mentioned: "The Natural Sun is Dead." This is one of the most puzzling of Swedenborg's statements. What does he mean by dead? The author refers to the dead bodies of men and animals, and then passes to what is inanimate, motionless, etc. The word inanimate simply means not animate, and adds nothing to the idea of dead. We certainly should not say that the sun is motionless. Then the author quotes to the effect that what is dead does not act of itself, but is acted upon. This is said to explain the appearance of life in nature, in the form of force and motion. Here the plot thickens. However mysterious, we usually think of force and motion as properties of bodies; bodies exert force and move. We do not think of desire, thought, will, as moving a book directly, but only through the arm and hand, i.e., bodies. How thought and will act upon the arm and hand is a very complicated and mysterious process, which the psychophysicists have not yet explained. If we identify force and motion with life, and life with spirit, we go deeper into complexities and difficulties; for when it is said that what is dead is acted upon by the forces of the spiritual world, and the dead resists and re-acts, we reflect that resistence and re-action are forms of action, and the definition of "dead" fails. We are not helped out of the difficulty by saying that "there is no life in the natural particle, but there is life around it"; for the difficulty is to think of life, or spiritual forces, acting from without upon the dead

body. It raises the whole question of the relation between spirit and matter. This relation is exemplified in the case of the relation between brain-state and mind-state, a relation which Professor William James called that of blank correspondence.

We are not questioning the truth or importance of Swedenborg's statements which the author quotes and paraphrases; we are concerned merely with the meaning of the statements. The author's treatment lacks interpretation, and leaves us in the bare statements to get what meaning we can. But this is hardly a fair, or respectful, treatment of Swedenborg. We should presume that Swedenborg meant something by what he said, and that he knew the meaning of the statements he made. In other words, these bare statements should be fitted into the context of his philosophy, and interpreted consistently. Otherwise they stand for little more than question marks.

What is said about the treatment of this topic is applicable to most of the other topics. The treatment is interesting and valuable for directing attention to the teachings; but the lack of interpretation and enlightenment is serious.

LEWIS F. HITE.

ANOTHER ONE-VOLUME BIBLE COMMENTARY*

The Bible reader or student is now very happily equipped with one-volume commentaries. The volume which appeared in 1909 under the editorship of Dr. Dummelow is still generally useful; that edited by Dr. Peake, appearing in 1919, was freer to adopt results of modern Bible study; and now a Commentary which is the work of a company of Anglican scholars headed by Dr. Gore offers comment in the light of the latest information on all the books of the Bible. Indeed, this Commentary has for one of its distinguishing marks that it includes in its treatment the

*A New Commentary on Holy Scripture, including the Apocrypha. Edited by Charles Gore, Henry Leighton Goudge, and Alfred Guillaume. New York: Macmillan Company. 1928. 1600 pp., 8vo. $5.00.

Apocrypha, thus bridging the gap in literary history between Old and New Testaments.

The Commentary has already received an enthusiastic welcome. The newspapers in England and in America treated its appearance as a news event. They made some ado over special Bible positions which it takes, but which have been the common teaching in standard seminaries for a quarter of a century.

The general standpoint of the work may be gathered from the opening sentences in the preface by the Editors.

> This Commentary is written by Anglican scholars who, while holding their faith, are determined in approaching the books to give their critical faculty, instructed by all the means within their power, its full and rightful freedom. It is hardly necessary to say that they have not found the results of legitimate criticism to conflict with the Catholic faith, though, believing, as they do, that criticism is a progressive science, and in the main a new science, their conclusions do very often differ widely from those which have been traditional.

Neither in the field of commentary nor in that of criticism, textual or literary and historical, has the New Church as yet developed a body of scholarship of its own. Our "commentaries" have been in the field of the Word's spiritual sense. For help in these other fields we depend on such a Commentary as this, which will probably be known more and more as Dr. Gore's. Despite some unsolved difficulties which we may have with newly recognized facts, and in spite of added interests which we have in Scripture, we shall also like to believe that our faith, as much as any traditional form of the Christian faith, has hospitable room for the results of Bible study.

As the reviewer has used one or another of the three leading one-volume Commentaries, it has seemed to him that each has its strong points. Dr. Gore's does not usually comment in the detail in which either of the others does. Sometimes this is no loss to the general reader or student; sometimes it is. All three volumes have excellent introductions to the several books of the Bible. These are particularly well written in this latest of commentaries. In a large number of historical items and literary details the new commentary of course offers what the

earlier works could not give. One of the especially useful features is the friendly counsel offered to the reader in several general articles, like the one entitled "Advice to the Ordinary Reader of the Historical Books," where he is helped with what Swedenborg helpfully discriminates as "apparent" and "genuine" truth in the Scripture story.

One of these more comprehensive and yet brief treatises in the Commentary is sure to arrest the eye of the New-Churchman. It is entitled "The Mystical Interpretation of the Old Testament." The author of it expresses himself favorably towards mystical interpretation within limits. We shall take comfort from this view, if we feel that Swedenborg's interpretation is of this order. In the light of some statements of his own, it is a little hard to see that it is. One would think that if mystical or allegorical interpretation were like his, it would have penetrated to some of his results; yet he uniformly speaks of the spiritual sense of the Word as "hitherto unknown." He also refers definitely to Jewish and Christian mystical interpreters, and declares that they would not credit his spiritual sense (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 4923[2]). Even if one considers the occasional insight of these interpreters a happy conjecture, there is Swedenborg's statement in "True Christian Religion," n. 776, that "no one has as yet had the least conjecture that there is a spiritual sense in the Word, such as this sense is in itself." The reviewer is of the opinion that it has been a mistake to confuse Swedenborg's interpretation with the ancient mystical or allegorical mode of understanding Scripture. It has hurt his better and different case. And while the Editors of the New Commentary have, with a characteristic catholicity, given space to a favorable view of mystical interpretation, they themselves express the well established and well justified unfavorable view of it: see pages 187-189, Part I; also p. 207b, Part III.

Among other general discussions are some entitled, "Introduction to the Criticism of the Pentateuch," "A Comparative Study of the Old Testament in the Light of Recent Anthropological and Archeological Research," "Environment Social,

Political, Intellectual and Religious, of Israel from Maccabees to our Lord," "The Political Background of the New Testament," "The Religious Background of the New Testament in Jewish Thought," "The Gentile Background of Early Christianity," "New Testament Prophecy and Apocalypse," "The Sacred Sites of the Gospels," "The Textual Criticism of the New Testament." These titles will indicate what a wealth of material is gathered into this volume of 1600 pages; and as the reader uses the commentary on any particular book of the Bible, we can promise him that he will be aware of the close scholarly acquaintance with that book which the commentator has. There is careful attention to apportionment of space among the more demanding books and the less demanding. Some of us are inclined to criticize a commentary because it does not leave its field for another, and give attention, for example, to the deeper meaning of Scripture; in its field of comment on what we call the sense of the letter of the Word this commentary is a beautifully executed and invaluable work.

WM. F. WUNSCH.

"THE ONE BOOK"*

It is certainly a very pleasant experience, in these days of criticising and modernizing everything from the Bible down, to find an author who treats the Word in a scholarly yet reverent manner, and who bears eloquent witness to its energizing and abiding Truth. He declares:

> [It is nothing less than a miracle] that these sixty-six books, written through nearly ten centuries, by so many men of such widely differing sorts, from places so far apart and under strikingly diverse circumstances, should have withstood the shock of wars, the wastage of migrations, the insidious attacks of persistent time itself, and have become one Book at last, through the inevitable, unhurried action of its

---

*_The One Book;_ the Result of an Examination of the Sources of the Holy Bible, and a Survey of Its Growth. By WARWICK JAMES PRICE. Philadelphia: The John C. Winston Company. 1928. 272 pp., 8vo., illus. $2.50

> Truth. . . . It is what it is from its inherent power, tested through more than four score and ten generations of men.

Mr. Price fully substantiates these statements in his neat volume of two hundred and fifty pages of text divided into fourteen chapters. These cover three main lines of thought: (a) the original sources of the books of Old Testament and New; (b) their several modern versions; and (c) the Bible in literature and in history. Some thirteen illustrations, mostly reproducing pages from early editions, add to the attractiveness of the volume.

The first four chapters are devoted to answering, so far as possible, the question, "Who wrote the Old Testament?" Here the author accepts many of the conclusions of the "higher" as well as of the "lower" criticism, yet in such a way as not to make one feel that the text has been torn asunder and the Divine Garment parted, as our Lord's outer garment was parted among the soldiers of Rome. He recognizes as probable contributors in the formation of the Old Testament books the hands and writings of several different writers designated by modern scholars as "J" (the Jahvist), "E" (the Elohist), "D" (from Deuteronomy), and "P" (the Priestly writer). Besides these there are the two Isaiahs, and the writings of the intermediate period between the days of the Old Testament and the New, which are more easily identified as to their authorship. With regard to the Prophets, he pays the highest tribute to Jeremiah. Far from considering that prophet a recorder merely of tribulations and lamentations, he quotes as an expression of his own opinion the words of another:

> In richness of imagery, in fullness of human interest, in lucidity and naturalness, in his command of the various resources of poetry, eloquence, pathos, and practical appeal, Jeremiah is the greatest of the writing prophets.

The interminable question of the authorship of the several books of the Word we have neither space nor ability to discuss at length here. From the New-Church point of view, one is inclined to brush at once aside such expressions as "terribly corrupted" and "obviously in great disorder" when applied to

parts of the Old Testament text by the so-called higher critics. And as for the doubtful and unknown writers "J" and "E," the doctrines of the New Church supply an entirely different and more satisfying explanation of the Jahvistic and Elohistic elements discernible in the early books. But in the end the author concludes, as we do in complete agreement with him, that the Word was in the process of growth for many centuries, probably even before the art of writing was known, and that it is a compilation from many varied sources. Yet, under the omnipotent hand of the Divine Providence, the Law, the Prophets, the sacred histories, and the Gospels have all been so moulded together as to form a perfect vessel, which can convey not only an external, literal sense or meaning adapted to a carnal-minded world, but also an internal, spiritual meaning perceptible by angels and spiritual-minded men. In short, then, we say regarding the authorship of the Word of God somewhat the same as has often been said about the authorship of Shakespere's works: We care little or nothing about the Shakespere-Bacon controversy; whoever wrote the plays, we revel in their wit and wisdom and their deeply-searching revelations of human character. Likewise with respect to the authorship of the Word: we need not be overmuch concerned about the varied human agencies and different channels through which it has come to us. The study of those agencies and channels, so far as we can discover them, only deepens our reverence for the Divine Hand that finally combined their work all in One Book, the source of heavenly wisdom for mankind. As our author says:

> I have come to the decision that the Bible is a supernatural book, that it voices the word of very truth . . . and that the only safety for the human race is to follow its teachings.

As to the study of the peoples who contributed to the formation of the Word and of their histories, the volume here under review offers the student several fascinating chapters. None of them is more interesting, however, than that dealing with the five centuries between the times of Ezra and those of John the Baptist. This period saw the coming of Persian influences into

the land of Judah, then the coming of Alexander and the Greeks, the development of the sects known as Pharisees and Sadducees, the advent of the Romans, and the building of the temple our Lord frequented. Single out of all this only one man's life-history and the far-reaching results of his successes and failures,—those of Alexander called "the Great"—and no further evidence is needed to prove that the Word is a supernatural Book, the formation of which was under Divine auspices and guidance. Not only was the Holy Land itself, situated at the eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea, incomparably well chosen as the central point between Asia, Africa, and Europe whence the light of the Word could spread to all the world, but this daring Greek seeker of more worlds to conquer was, under Providence, made the means of carrying his highly articulate language throughout those lands and into Egypt. There the Old Testament was translated into the Greek Septuagint, and the people of Palestine were prepared—as a part of that wonderful "way prepared for the Lord"—for the writing of the New Testament in the beautifully clear Greek language.

As a whole, therefore, this volume is to be very highly commended, both to special students of the Sacred Scriptures and to those laymen who "delight in the law of the Lord" and take keen interest in learning the mysterious ways of the Divine Providence in the soul-affairs of men.

CHAUNCEY G. HUBBELL.

"OUR ASIATIC CHRIST"*

"Our Asiatic Christ," by Prof. O. M. Buck of Drew Theological Seminary, is an instructive and inspiring little work by "one who loves India as the land of his birth and boyhood and profession." According to the author.

> [It] deals with India, who, with the rich heritage of her past, faces confusedly the new day. Just what to grasp and what to let go is an ever-insistent problem. . . .

**Our Asiatic Christ.* By PROF. OSCAR MACMILLAN BUCK. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1927. 181 pp., 16mo. $1.25.

It deals with the Christ, "the only name the West has carried into the East, which the East has received and praised and loved with sincerity and without qualification."

In its effort to depict India's reaction to the preaching of Christ, the book is spiritually akin to "The Christ of the Indian Road" and "Christ at the Round Table," by Rev. E. Stanley Jones, with whom our author has had personal companionship. Its style is rich, racy, fervid, and joyful. Its five chapters abound in striking excerpts from native sources, and display a rare faculty of discerning the real meaning of Indian thought.

The special theme of the volume is the growing Hindu sense of proprietorship in the person of Jesus, which is stated by Professor Buck as follows:

Mother Asia is becoming self-conscious, and beginning to gather together all her assets. She is discovering, strangely enough, that Jesus of Nazareth is one of her own sons. She has taken Him, lo, these many centuries, to be European.

But the writer takes pain to note at the outset, that the appropriation of Christ by the Hindu as his rightful possession, does not mean the appropriation of Western Christianity. While India is drinking in the spirit and teachings of Jesus, she is straining out the theology and morals of Christendom as misrepresentations of Jesus. Western religion is not regarded as Christianity, but as "churchianity," from which the person and sayings of Jesus must needs be delivered and reinterpreted for Asia by Asiatics.

Briefly touching upon the high lights in the history of Christian missions, the author draws a striking contrast between the present openness of the Hindu mind and the adamantine front it formerly presented. He sees India in the throes of a religious revolution, in common with the rest of the world, without discerning the real reason therefor,—so apparent to one familiar with the spiritual world changes of 1757, known to students of Swedenborg as "the Final Judgment."

The body of the book deals with the basis of a *rapprochement* of Christ and Hindu religion. Four great principles,—(1) "ahimsa," non-violence, harmlessness, gentleness, (2) "yoga,"

restraint of the senses for the sake of a larger, truer life, (3) "jiwan mukti," release of life, freedom, and (4) "ananda," bliss, or abounding joy,—are set forth as the essence of Hindu religious thought, and as furnishing the standards by which the oriental mind would measure the life and teachings of Jesus. The writer discusses what in the person and precepts of Jesus is akin to these Hindu sentiments; and he finds it plentifully, of course, in His care for the children and the sparrows, in His compassion for the sick and the sinful, in His willing endurance of the cross and inculcation of cross-bearing, in His leading to life by "the strait gate and the narrow way," in finding life by losing it, and in the manifold promises of joy and happiness eternal as the lot of faithful disciples.

That this similarity between the Hindu and the Christian sentiments is often more seeming than real, should not escape our attention. The traditional Hindu understanding of harmlessness, sense restraint, soul freedom, and bliss, has roots quite at variance with similar things in the life of Christ, and leads to widely different conduct. The repugnance to taking life, especially animal life, in the Hindu mind is associated with the notion of reincarnation, and the fear that in slaying animals one may be inadvertently slaying men, even relatives. Restraint of the senses in "yoga" is not the avoidance of sin there, but the annihilation of the faculty of sensation. Liberation of the spirit to a Hindu is not the enlargement of his powers of unselfish love and thought, but chiefly absorption of his soul in God, like a drop of water in the infinitude of the ocean. The bliss of the Hindu is a mere ecstasy divorced from the moral quality of human love and service. The principle of righteousness for righteousness' sake seems absent from Hindu theology. As the writer says: "India wants joy, not morality; beatitude, not commandment." Such differences point to a real danger when Asiatics attempt to read their interpretations into the life of Jesus,—the danger of corrupting the very thing to which they look for salvation.

Will this new appreciation of Jesus conquer India, and transform it, or will India merely assimilate Jesus, add another

"Mahatma" to her long list, and remain pagan? This is the crux of the situation as Professor Buck sees it, in quoting the words of a Hindu university student:

> Christ was an Asiatic, and we claim Him as ours. But He will shine alongside the great teachers of India, not dimming their light. The stars and the moon get along well together.

Is it to be moonrise or sunrise in India? Professor Buck asks. His outlook is hopeful.

The reading of the book leaves one with a renewed conviction that the Lord is making His way into the heart of India as into all other countries, in the effort to establish Himself as "the Only God of Heaven and Earth"; and one is cheered by it. Yet how one wishes that Swedenborg might reach the mind of India! For neither orthodox Christianity nor orthodox Hinduism can bridge the gulf between the heart of India and the heart of Jesus. New light on both these religions is imperative. India is no more true to the original intent and meaning of her scriptures than Christendom is to hers. India's religion is a decadence, and so is Christendom's. In the Christian teachings of Swedenborg will be found the correction of both, and their true unity.

Swedenborg is indeed very much nearer to Hindu philosophy than any other occidental philosopher is; and the full import of that fact awaits development. As I read Professor Buck's book, the terms used by him in setting forth the essentials of Hindu religion were constantly being matched in my mind by similar ones gathered from long acquaintance with Swedenborg's works, yet with a sense so different and indubitably true that the heights from which India in times past had plunged into magic, and sorcery, and pantheism, and man-worship, and superstition of every kind, were clearly apparent. From the examination of the ruins, one may surmise what the original temple was. If Indians, like Christians, can only learn that they have "fallen," then restoration is at hand. "The one religion of humanity," as Balzac discovered, is here. It is wrongly known as "Swedenborgianism."

HERBERT C. SMALL.

"THE THEORY OF PROBABILITY"*

There is a considerable body of literature on the theory of probability, the most generally available ample treatise on the subject being that in the "Encyclopedia Britannica," which contains numerous bibliographical references. Had the volume now before us* been published long enough ago, it doubtless would have been one of the studies of the subject drawn upon by the author of that article, because the late William Burnside was recognized as a master among mathematicians, and whatever he wrote in the field of mathematics showed originality deserving notice. Born in 1852 and dying in 1927, Burnside did not turn his attention to the theory of probability until about 1918, after which he wrote a number of papers on various aspects of the subject, leading finally to the production of the manuscript of the present volume in 1925, never quite finished owing to the illness which struck him late in that year, a recurrence of which brought the end less than two years ago. The prefatory matter of the volume is a memoir prepared by his friend, Prof. Andrew Russell Forsyth of Cambridge University, for the Royal Society, and reprinted here from the Proceedings of that Society. Professor Forsyth is a noted mathematician, whose broad knowledge of the theory of probability is evidenced by historical and critical remarks in the course of his paper. In it he informs us that "probability, as a mathematical theory, has not yet lent itself to a single process of organized development based on any unique set of ideas, which are generally accepted as fundamental,"—which affirmation implies a considerable amount of originality in Burnside's treatise; and he further asserts that "all Burnside's published work is close and firm in texture, yet to an attentive reader it is never lacking in clearness and movement." To anyone desirous of exploring the mathematical theory of probability, therefore, Burnside's volume can unhesitatingly be recommended; but unless one is

*_Theory of Probability._ By WILLIAM BURNSIDE, Sc.D., LL.D., F.R.S. Cambridge: University Press (New York: Macmillan). 1928. xxx, 106 pp., 8vo. $3.50.

interested in the computations connected with problems of chance based on such matters as the flipping of coins, or the drawing of balls of one color from a box or boxes containing balls of two different colors, or the likelihood of certain kinds of hands in bridge, etc., etc., one is not likely to become absorbed in such a book, excellent though it may be in its own field.

The consideration of such a work in the pages of a religious periodical may seem quite out of place; and perhaps it is so. But within the entire field open to investigation from the standpoint of the mathematics of probability, there is at least one subject of very great importance to man as a being with religious interests, though (so far as we know) that subject is always omitted from consideration in any treatise in this department of knowledge, doubtless in part due to the extreme indefiniteness of any mathematical formula that might be devised in connection with it, and the limited developments that are theoretically possible. We refer to the question, whether or not the universe as we know it is the product of chance. No one can deny that that is a supremely important question.

Now, in the history of the entire universe, and especially of that part of it upon which we exist, conditions as they now are have come about either by chance or by purpose. It is a definite alternative; there is no possible third choice other than one involving both, and resulting in a dualistic conception of the universe. But at the present moment we can consider the matter as a definite alternative,—either chance or purpose. If not chance, then purpose; and purpose involves mind. And an adequate mind for the process means God. To demonstrate the existence of God, therefore, the argument should show that the process of development that has brought about the present condition of things could not have been one purely of chance.

Scientists are inclined to believe that, while it is impossible to affirm with assurance that among the billions of suns in the starry heavens there are not numerous planets as capable of the phenomena of life as is the Earth, yet it is highly improbable that the right conditions exist in many instances; for all life (as we know it) depends upon certain properties of water.

Furthermore, all life depends upon certain conditions of heat and light. When the Earth cooled to a condition suited to the condensation of water as a permanent ocean completely covering its surface, it might conceivably have remained in that condition forever afterward; in other words, it does not now seem inevitable that the solid crust underneath the liquid mass should have wrinkled so that land should have emerged over a considerable area. Moreover, it is reasonably certain that, through the greater part of the pre-historic period of the solid Earth, conditions were not right for the appearance of living matter; and yet, whether by special creation or by what is called "spontaneous generation" (concerning which there is no generally accepted scientific evidence), protoplasm finally came into existence; and it still exists in enormous quantities. Why all protoplasm should not have remained forever in its amorphous condition, is a complete mystery; but some of it proceeded to evolve (I use the term in the usual naturalistic sense). And it proceeded not merely to evolve, but also to differentiate into the two great classes that we know as vegetable and animal, the latter of which is dependent upon the former for its existence. And in the animal kingdom the line of ascent from protozoa up to the primates passed (it is assumed) through many intervening forms necessary to the final emergence of the latter class; and along that line of development the marvelous senses and appetites and instincts and behavioristic reactions and seemingly free activities appeared, and grew from less to more. Finally the skull cavity of one of the primates became greatly enlarged, with similar increase in the brain substance within; and that brain became surrounded with a gray matter, which seems to be the seat of wonderful faculties, by which the animal so endowed proceeded to subdue the world to its own purposes. In its history, that highest animal has accumulated knowledge, devised language, produced writings in scientific, philosophic, and (having conceived a creator) theologic fields, not to mention purely literary performances; has carved sculpture, built architecture, limned paintings; has invented instruments for producing and modulating sweet

sounds, and has cooperated to perform marvelous symphonic creations; has explored the realms of nature in the infinitely great and the infinitely little; has invented vehicles for earth, sea, and air; has harnessed the waterfalls to do its work; has discovered how to make the whole world hear one living voice.

In the development of the entire universe from its original condition up to the condition we now find here on Earth, there have probably been innumerable steps which as a series, leading up to man as the final product, may be considered as the links in a chain, the omission of any one of which would have made the emergence of man impossible. At each step the probability that there would occur the next step needed to carry the development on towards man was indefinitely small; in some cases certainly as small as approximately one to infinity, and in the average case certainly as small as one to an indefinitely large number. Therefore the ratio between the initial unit at the first stage of the process to the indefinitely large number at the final stage of the process can with assurance be expressed by the ratio "as one is to infinity." In short, the likelihood that the development of our solar system from nebula to its present condition has taken place by chance and not by continuous creation is practically as one is to infinity. That ratio certainly rules out chance, implies purpose, and proves theism the only tenable theory.

B. A. WHITTEMORE.

SPECIAL SUBSCRIPTION OFFER

The regular price for the NEW-CHURCH REVIEW is $2.00
and for the NEW-CHURCH LEAGUE JOURNAL is $1.00

WE OFFER
A JOINT SUBSCRIPTION TO BOTH FOR $2.50

provided such joint subscription adds a new name to at least one of the periodicals. Such joint subscription may be addressed either to the LEAGUE JOURNAL or to the

NEW-CHURCH REVIEW, 134 Bowdoin St., BOSTON, MASS.

THE NEW CHURCH MAGAZINE

The Quarterly Organ of the General Conference of the New Church in Great Britain is the oldest New-Church periodical. It is of great interest to New-Church people in all parts of the world. Subscription price $1.25 per year, postpaid.

Order from the
Massachusetts New-Church Union
134 Bowdoin St., Boston 9, Mass.

THEOLOGICAL WORKS OF EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

STANDARD EDITION, $1.00 per volume, postpaid
Also LATIN and LATIN-ENGLISH EDITIONS.
Send for catalogue containing complete lists.

FOR MISSIONARY PURPOSES

we supply the UNIFORM EDITION books (paper) at 5 cents per copy, postpaid. The titles in this edition are: "Heaven and Hell," "Divine Love and Wisdom," "Divine Providence," and "The Four Doctrines."

SWEDENBORG FOUNDATION
Incorporated

18 East 41st Street **New York, N. Y.**

THE ROTCH TRUST FUND

Mrs. Lydia S. Rotch died in Boston, July 20, 1863, at the age of 80 years. She left $15,000 to be administered by three trustees for the benefit of the Convention. The activity of this Fund, administered by its successive three trustees, has been primarily that of the publication of Swedenborg's Theological Writings, commentaries compiled therefrom, and other works, as follows:

A complete edition of the Theological Works published by Swedenborg.

"The Worship and Love of God."

Commentaries on Matthew, John, Ezekiel and the Psalms.

Selections from Swedenborg, in raised type for the blind.

"Swedenborg, Harbinger of the New Age of the Christian Church," by Benjamin Worcester.

All of these publications are available through the several New-Church book-rooms, to wit:

UNITED STATES.

Akron, Ohio. New-Church Book Room, 117 So. High St.
Baltimore, Md. Swedenborg Book Center, 3812 Barrington Road.
Boston, Mass. Massachusetts New-Church Union, 134 Bowdoin St.
Chicago, Ill. Western New-Church Union, Room 1726, 17 N. State St.
Cincinnati, Ohio. New-Church Library, Oak and Winslow Streets.
Detroit, Mich. Church Book Shop, 92 E. Forest Ave.
Los Angeles, Calif. New-Church Book Room, 509 So. Westmoreland Ave.
Minneapolis, Minn. New-Church Book Shop, 903 Fifth Ave., So.
New York, N. Y. Swedenborg Foundation, Inc., 18 E. 41 St., Manhattan. New-Church Press, 108 Clark St., Brooklyn Heights, N. Y. City.
Philadelphia, Pa. New-Church Book Association, 2129 Chestnut St.
San Francisco, Calif. New-Church Library, 1640 O'Farrell St.
St. Louis, Mo. New-Church Book Room, 1215 Sunset Ave.
Washington, D. C. New-Church Library, 16th and Corcoran Street.
Wilmington, Del. New-Church Book Room, Penn Ave. and Broome St.

CANADA.

Toronto, Ont. Wm. H. Law, 486 Euclid Ave.

ENGLAND.

London. The Swedenborg Society, and The New-Church Press, Ltd., 20 Hart St., Bloomsbury, W. C. 1.
Manchester. New-Church Book Depot, 34 John Dalton St.
Glasgow, Scotland. Scottish New-Church Library, 229 Woodland Road.

AUSTRALIA.

Brisbane, Queensland, 345 Ann St., near Wharf St.

INDIA.

Bombay, Swedenborg Society of India, 7 Topiwala's Bldgs., Sandhurst Road, Girgaum, Bombay.

SWITZERLAND.

Lausanne, Agence des Publications de la Nouvelle Eglise, 1 Avenue de France.

The Fund assists, from time to time, in other New-Church uses to the extent that it has available funds; for example, the Neighborhood House at Lynn, Mass., to the support of which it regularly contributes. It has also coöperated in the publication of some of Swedenborg's scientific works, and of the photofacsimile reproductions of Swedenborg's theological manuscripts.

The original sum is intact, and the income only is used. This is, of course, entirely inadequate to help all the uses which come before the Rotch Trustees for contributions, including many for which other New-Church funds are not available because of their limitations. It is estimated that since the death of Mrs. Rotch, the trustees have spent over $65,000.00 in various church uses.

Will friends of the New Church continually bear in mind the importance of increasing the Rotch Trust Fund, whether by "giving while living" or by will?

The present Trustees are:

GEORGE C. WARREN, *President*,
CHARLES N. MASON,
JOHN W. HATHAWAY, *Secretary and Treasurer*,
18 Tremont St., Boston, Mass.